

891.806
56313 V.1-2
The Slavic
and
East European Journal

Vol. XV, No. 1

Spring 1957

CONTENTS

From the Editor	3
-----------------------	---

PART ONE

Intelligentsia in Nineteenth-Century Russia	Herbert E. Bowman	5
Russian Eighteenth-Century Literature Through Party-Colored Spectacles.....	Gleb Struve	22
Goral Songs Recorded in Canada.....	J. B. Rudnyčkyj	34
Notes on Russian Etymologies.....	Felix J. Oinas	41

PART TWO

The Case for the Slavic Literature Course in Translation.....	Leon I. Twarog	47
--	----------------	----

REVIEWS

<u>Indiana Slavic Studies</u> , Vol. I, ed. Michael Ginsburg and J. T. Shaw.....	Oleg A. Maslenikov	64
Janko Lavrin, <u>Goncharov</u>	Edmund Zawacki	66
Isaac Babel, <u>The Collected Stories</u>	Vera Sandomirsky	66
Justinia Besharov, <u>Imagery of the Igor' Tale</u>	George Y. Shevelov	67
<u>Adam Mickiewicz: In Commemoration, and Adam Mickiewicz: Selected Poetry and Prose</u>	M. M. Coleman	69
Stanisław Westfal, <u>A Study in Polish Morphology: The Genitive Singular Masculine</u>	Z. Folejewski	70
Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord, <u>Serbocroatian Heroic Songs</u>	Joseph Strmecki	71
Thomas F. Magner, <u>Introduction to the Serbo-Croatian Language</u>	Albert B. Lord	73
<u>Area Study Programs: The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe</u>	Edmund Ordon	74

NEWS AND NOTES	76
----------------------	----

Transliteration	79
-----------------------	----

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich	J. B. Rudnyŕkyj
University of Washington	University of Manitoba
Zbigniew Folejewski	Anthony Salys
University of Wisconsin	University of Pennsylvania
William E. Harkins	Thomas A. Sebeok
Columbia University	Indiana University
The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S. J.	Gleb Struve
Fordham University	University of California
Claude P. Lemieux	Nicholas Vakar
U. S. Naval Academy	Wheaton College
Horace Lunt	René Wellek
Harvard University	Yale University
Oleg A. Maslenikov	
University of California	

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Note: The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

Articles submitted should follow strictly the directions for typing and style as contained in the MLA Style Sheet and should use the transliteration system employed by this Journal. Unaccepted manuscripts accompanied by postage will be returned.

FROM THE EDITOR

Slavic and East European studies have developed in the United States and Canada to the point that scholars and teachers have come to feel the need for a professional periodical devoted primarily to research in the humanities and to pedagogy, in the Slavic and East European field. The Slavic and East European Journal will attempt to satisfy this need.

The Slavic and East European Journal, like its predecessor The AATSEEL Journal, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL of the U.S., Inc.). By publishing through the facilities of Indiana University, it has become possible to expand the publication from its former maximum of 32 pages to 80 pages per quarterly issue. The additional pages are to be devoted to research articles; approximately the same space as in the past will continue to be devoted to pedagogical articles, bibliography, reviews, and news and notes. Changing the AATSEEL publication from a pedagogical journal to a journal of research and pedagogy has led to its being given a new name which, it is hoped, will better suggest its new contents and nature. The present IBM-set, lithoprinted form of the Journal was chosen as making possible the timely publication of news and announcements, as well as articles requiring special symbols.

The different sections of The Slavic and East European Journal are planned as follows:

Research Articles. Research articles are invited in the humanities, especially in the fields of Slavic and East European linguistics, literatures, and folklores. The areas of interest to the Journal include the interrelationships of these fields with their intellectual and cultural background and with the arts. The Journal welcomes articles reflecting divergent

views and approaches to research.

Pedagogical Articles. The Slavic and East European Journal, like its predecessor The AATSEEL Journal, will publish articles on the theory and practice of teaching — on all levels — in the field of Slavic and East European studies. Contributions on the interrelationships between language and literature programs and area programs in the field will also be of interest to the Journal.

Reviews. An attempt will be made, within the limitations of space, to publish reviews of all books having professional interest and published in the United States or Canada, or in English anywhere. Reviews of selected significant books printed abroad in other languages will also appear. It is hoped that this latter category of reviews can be expanded in the future.

News and Notes. This section will include news and announcements of meetings, developments in the field, and of AATSEEL chapters, and notes on matters of professional interest.

Bibliography. The Journal hopes to make available to its subscribers annually the American Slavic and East European Bibliography for the preceding year. The scope of the bibliography will include all books, articles, and significant reviews which are published in the United States and in Canada, and by Americans in publications appearing abroad, and which are of professional interest in the humanities, including specifically the fields of linguistics, literature, folklore, pedagogy, and intellectual and cultural background. Information is desired as to whether readers of this Journal would like for this bibliography, in future years, to include significant foreign publications of books and articles in learned journals. In addition, bibliographical notes may be published, on occasion, in individual issues.

Forum. From time to time, pages of the Journal may provide a forum for articles or communications on current subjects of general interest.

J. T. Shaw

PART ONE

INTELLIGENTSIA IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIA

By Herbert E. Bowman

University of Oregon

The word intelligentsia, as it came to be used in pre-Revolutionary Russia, carries in itself a rich context of cultural history. This curious and untranslatable word, first made current in Russia in the 1860's, designates one of the chief characters of Russian intellectual history for almost exactly a century: from 1825 to 1917. More than any word or combination of words, it points toward that direction in Russian intellectual life which ultimately carried the Russian nation into Soviet Communism.

Intelligentsia is clearly a Russian transcription of the Latin word intelligentia, meaning "understanding" or "discernment." But the word so borrowed from Western culture was given a wholly new value in Russia. There the word lost its meaning as an abstraction and came to mean instead a special grouping of individuals; so that one now spoke of members of the intelligentsia. Modern English is familiar with this usage, since the languages of Western Europe borrowed the word back again after its Russian sojourn, still bearing its Russian emphasis. Its Western usage is looser: in English, for example, "intelligentsia" usually means all those who know, who are educated or expert, either in some one area or in general capacity. This looser meaning has also at times marked the Russian use of the word.

Whatever its special uses, the word intelligentsia is clearly bound to suggest some relationship to intelligence or knowledge or intellectual power. But from the beginning of its use in Russia a complication existed: the word intelligentsia, as meaning men of knowledge, was immediately implicated in the struggles of Russian intellectual life. Especially by the Sixties, the words "knowledge," "enlightenment," and even "science" had themselves become controversial terms; "enlightenment" in particular had become the slogan of a crusade. Intelligentsia immediately shared this tendentious character, and the membership of the intelligentsia included from the beginning all those "enlightened" spirits who were in pursuit of that truth which should set Russia free. To be a member of the intelligentsia thus signified not merely to know, but to know in an effort to advance the cause—the cause of national freedom and progress. All Russians who thought seriously at all were indeed likely by the time of the Sixties to be thinking about the one great cause of Russia's welfare and national destiny. Under an oppressive tsarist rule, those few who were still capable of independent thought were pressed closer and closer together, into a more or less self-conscious community; their embattled band could even be given a name—the name intelligentsia.

Thus from the beginning of its use in Russian intellectual life intelligentsia suggests a unity, a community of thought and attitude. Its members, however diverse, belonged together on some platform. But on what platform precisely? How could a common concern for the national welfare always bind together; would such concern not have an equal effect of setting apart? [The fact is that the history of the intelligentsia is a history of increasing exclusiveness.] This same word that can be used to apply to practically all the eminent intellectuals of the Thirties and Forties, indicated as the century advanced a more and more self-conscious vanguard devoted to a more and more particular complex of values and ideals. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Russian intellectual life was marked by the dramatic event of intellectuals,

such as Berdjaev and Bulgakov, dropping out of the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia by that time had clearly become something like an ideological faction. It then remained only for activists such as Lenin to give leadership to a political program drawn from inherited ideological principles, for the history of the intelligentsia to end in the political activity of the Bolshevik Revolution. From being a diffuse description of a loosely recruited circle of critics of the Russian scene, [the term intelligentsia thus came to designate the bearers of a revolutionary movement.] A conservative professor or a reactionary minister of education would obviously not be counted among the intelligentsia in this stricter sense. On the other hand, an illiterate might belong to the intelligentsia if he shared its way of thought—an eventuality possible in principle but, of course, unlikely in fact.

To use the word intelligentsia with this intention of a particular ideological direction does not imply, unfortunately for precision, that the word is always so used in Russian. It is obviously impossible to confine so inclusive a word to a limited partisan usage. Thus, for example, the early twentieth-century reaction against that intelligentsia which had its roots in the Sixties, liberated the word again, allowing it to apply to intellectuals generally. For why should one continue to reserve such a term of prestige precisely for those who had now lost intellectual prestige? By the same token, the Soviet usage of the word makes it refer to Soviet intellectual workers generally, for they of course constitute the new intellectual vanguard.

It is important to notice that this looser meaning of the term lies at the origin of its particular nineteenth-century usage. For the Russian revolutionary movement had its origins in the generalized philosophical and apolitical criticism of unprofessionalized intellectuals. Russian intellectual life, especially by the third decade of the nineteenth century, had entered a period of revitalized national consciousness, of national awakening. Unhappily, it was an awakening to a grim realization of national backwardness.

Čadaev, writing at the end of the 1820's, only repeated in sharper terms what most of his contemporaries were ready to admit when he cried: "Alone in the world, we have given nothing to the world; taught it nothing." Yet this sense of Russia's cultural worthlessness was at the same time accompanied by a growing national pride and cultural ambition. Thus Belinskij described these same years which followed 1825 as an Age of Nationality (narodnost'), an age in which Russian intellectual life, particularly in the form of literature, sought to express a native significance and originality. With newly aroused feelings of national pride, the Russian intellectual looked despairingly upon the backwardness, as he conceived it, of Russian cultural life. He was inspired to undertake single-handed a critical attack upon the total structure of Russian national life. From these first beginnings of developing national self-consciousness in the nineteenth century, the first members of the intelligentsia were stimulated to direct their criticism against the entire foundation of Russian cultural existence. They thus inclined toward "radicalism" from the first: impatient with merely pruning the dead leaves of national culture, they insisted upon a deliberate probing at the roots; they turned their scrutiny not upon any particular pathological detail, but upon the total organism, in the conviction that no single organ of the national life would function regularly until the total organism was regulated.

Out of this "totalitarian" conviction that all parts of the national life must be examined together in their totality, there developed the phenomenon of the Russian "critic" as an intellectual who took all knowledge and all critical speculation about Russian problems as his province. As a publicist, writing for the most part in the influential literary journals, [he took upon himself the charge of creating public opinion, of giving direction to Russian thinking generally.] In the course of a critical review of a literary work, he could feel free to pass judgment upon serfdom, the rights of women, or the condition of education; and his understanding and appreciation of any literary or scholarly work under review were themselves frequently made to depend upon the position to which

Early R.
intell.

Victims
of Russ
Cal Back

whole system

dividing
opinion

Bowma

his pri

TH

were j

alizati

status

read w

French

which

try wh

ary. I

find re

a peas

peram

TH

official

inspire

torial

examp

ret me

even th

were q

with th

expose

univer

came t

lished

injusti

tellige

Su

and po

intelli

which

loose t

or res

his private ideology had moved.

This sweeping boldness and resolute independence of thought were joined, in the man of the intelligentsia, with a desperate realization of his practical helplessness in a social and political status quo which triumphantly denied all his arguments. He might read widely and expound at length upon Hegelianism of the Left or French socialism, but meanwhile he lived under a government which deprived him of the most elementary civil rights, in a country where to be a "citizen" meant by his lights to be a revolutionary. Nor was the typical spokesman of the intelligentsia likely to find response among the mass of the populace, for the most part a peasant mass, traditionally loyal to tsarist authority and temperamentally suspicious of intellectuals.

This sense of being an embattled few, hopelessly beset by official repression from above and popular apathy from below, inspired in the intelligentsia from its earliest years a conspiratorial mood. Even the least revolutionary subjects—Kant, for example—could take on the color of conspiracy if pursued at secret meetings of a clandestine circle. This circle-spirit pervaded even the subscribers to the radical journals, whose articles they were quick to read between the lines, cherishing a secret bond with the author that even the most perspicacious censor could not expose. The mentality of the private circle, first created by the university student circles of the Twenties and Thirties, thereby came to dominate the life of the intelligentsia, even in their published writings. This cultivation of secrecy, fed upon feelings of injustice and oppression, only served of course to alienate the intelligentsia further from the whole of their enviroming reality.

Such a radical separation from the practical realities of social and political life deeply aggravated the characteristic faults of the intelligentsia. Freed from the necessity of dealing with a reality which on principle they totally rejected, their thought was set loose to range at will; and thought which met none of the checks or rested upon none of the assurances of practical existence could

range to the furthest extremism. The status of the intelligentsia as an isolated minority of "superfluous" men thus helped to make them radical. Dobroljubov remarked of Gončarov's hero, Oblomov, that he had no sense of the possible because he never did anything. Similarly, for the intelligentsia of the nineteenth century their characteristic failure to develop a sense of measure, of compromise, of balance, aroused no scrutiny among men who typically took no active part in practical affairs.

The isolation of the intelligentsia in nineteenth-century Russian life is a fact of many facets. By social origin, they were typically in revolt or at least in separation from their parental class and occupation. In age, the most active members of the intelligentsia were remarkably youthful, and they showed the intensity as well as the impulsiveness of youth. Perhaps even the unprofessional nature of their training and the wide-ranging character of their thought is also an aspect of their separation from any established function in the national community. Geographically, the intelligentsia is a phenomenon of the capitals; perhaps some sign of their distance from the grass-roots of Russian life is indicated by that fact.

Such an aloof and distant body of radical critics, eloquent with systematic denunciations of the whole structure of Russian life, was of course bound to suffer the hostility of the authorities. As the nineteenth century progressed, that hostility sharpened. Indeed, the intelligentsia became locked with the monarchy in a fateful vicious circle: the more radical or terroristic the intelligentsia became, the more fearful and self-protective the authorities became, and so the more repressive; and against increased repression the revolutionaries reacted by sharper attacks. By the time of the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, Russian life presented the harrowing spectacle of desperate revolutionary terror facing an almost immobilized tsarist authority. Whenever the façade of imperial power collapsed in a new national catastrophe such as the Crimean War or the Russo-Japanese War, the

forces of revolution surged forward—until the final collapse in the débacle of the First World War.

Increasingly convinced, as the decades of the nineteenth century passed, that the tsarist power had no real basis for existence, the intelligentsia worked to evolve within itself a new authority over the national life. That claim to set up as a new authority became more explicit as time passed. But the intelligentsia from its beginnings, by its nature, was a new focus of authority, in a situation in which traditional authority was radically repudiated. Such a drive to self-assertion was motivated by the original consciousness out of which the intelligentsia was formed: the consciousness of a need for direction in Russian life. It was inevitable that this conviction of a need for national leadership would be felt with unusual force and urgency in a nation where an ignorant and illiterate peasant majority was led by a monarchical rule which seemed at times even less enlightened than its hapless subjects. In the minds of those who dared to think critically about the problems of Russian nationhood, a whole new understanding of the national life was called for. They turned to devising an intellectual conceptualization of the totality of Russian culture. They grappled with such questions as: Where is Russia going? What is her mission in the world? Is Russia, or should she be, a part of Western civilization? These questions, the largest that could be asked, for a while seriously occupied the most perceptive minds in Russia. The original problems of the intelligentsia were thus philosophical, historical, metaphysical—always unalterably intellectual. Leadership meant intellectual leadership, and its jurisdiction was the whole of the national life. Political, moral, historical, even literary problems had to be seen in the context of an ideological system. Thus from its beginnings the Russian intelligentsia was nurtured upon the conviction that a conscious, rational plan, intellectually elaborated, and possible only out of the deliberations of the intelligentsia itself, could alone rescue Russian culture. The history of the intelligentsia is the history

of its varied ideological deliberations; but throughout that history, the member of the intelligentsia remained convinced that only within his charmed circle could the total truth about Russian life reside. Ideological convictions moved, in the course of the decades, from Schelling to Hegel to Fourier to Feuerbach to Marx, but the slogan continued to be: "We understand how history is moving." Such self-assurance about history was not a late achievement of the intelligentsia; it was implicit in its first-interests. Thus Čadaev was not content to discuss the Russian problem until he had seen it in the context of a whole philosophy of history. From the beginnings of emerging Russian nationalism, the Russian problem was posed as a problem in world history.

The slogan "We understand how history is moving" suggests two inseparable traits of the intelligentsia—traits suggested by the word intelligentsia itself: a radical self-assertion, which is always the assertion of an intellectual superiority. The member of the intelligentsia was only too conscious of his practical inefficacy, even to the point of futility; but he expressed a never-failing confidence that he was one of the "enlightened." In a society so dismal as tsarist society always seemed to him, to be enlightened might almost assure that one would be ineffective, unrecognized, out of the running. A sense of eliteness among the intelligentsia thus long preceded any elaboration of a political mission. The realization that only a tightly-knit "party" could effectively manage radical political activity developed as a later refinement or application, out of an earlier and more general realization that the enlightened members of Russian society were few, that they necessarily constituted an embattled minority.

Many special causes have at various times been adduced to account for the undemocratic character of the Russian revolutionary movement and of the regime in which it culminated. Even a native Russian love of oppression, or a national affection for the power-principle, has been hinted at. But such speculative reasons are hardly needed to explain the elitist tendencies of a group

whose every important feature adds only one more detail to a picture which combines social isolation with intellectual superiority. The very books they read—the latest gospel always came in French or German or English—typify their distance from their fellow-countrymen and at the same time their knowledge of the latest (European) thought.

This general elitist pattern which from the beginning and by definition marked the attitudes of the intelligentsia, was bound to determine a subsequent history of factional disputes. Whoever says, "We understand how history is moving," is soon obliged to decide who "we" are. As the ideological debate becomes more complex and as the struggle for power intensifies, the "we" comes to be more and more strictly and narrowly defined. The twentieth-century story of the progressive narrowing from Social Democrat to Bolshevik to Leninist to Lenin himself, is only a final elaboration of a tendency which marks the whole course of the intelligentsia of the nineteenth century: a tendency to become more and more exclusive. This increasing exclusiveness progressively narrowed the meaning of the word intelligentsia itself, until it meant a quite definite tradition for those authors who subjected it to searching critical attack in a series of essays called Landmarks (Vexi), published in 1909. That famous attack is only a single illustration of the fact that at that time one could be a critic of Russian society and culture without sharing the particular outlook of the intelligentsia.

While the exclusiveness of the intelligentsia as a group gathered force during the century, so did the revolutionary character of their ideas point more and more sharply toward radical condemnation and active revolt. So formidably did the social problem increase in urgency and gravity in their thought as the century advanced that even the attempts of the government at reform—such as the emancipation of the serfs—only increased their restlessness and dissatisfaction; so that the most promising period of reforms in the 1860's was also the period when revolutionary thought first became explicit and systematic. Moreover, each new failure

on the part of the government, as well as each new report from Europe of the enthronement of philistinism there, added new ardor to the repudiation of the status quo. Meanwhile the membership of the intelligentsia was coming increasingly to be drawn from the lower orders of the social hierarchy, so that the sons of village priests and other lower orders on the social scale were already by the Sixties taking the places once occupied by a disaffected nobility. Such elements in the social structure brought with them a sharper animus against the established culture, for they added to the intellectual criticism of an older nobility a personal quarrel against a society which accorded them no honorable or even useful place.

At the same time ideological tendencies which had once been cultivated or permitted within the still formless tradition of the earlier intelligentsia, became narrower, more militant, at times more strident. Out of the original philosophy of criticism which marked the Twenties and Thirties, currents of thought emerged which soon moved in opposite and antagonistic directions. Thus Slavophilism, with its hope for a native Russian culture with an inner strength to preserve itself from the corruption of foreign imitation, represented at first an emphasis to which all members of the intelligentsia of the Twenties and Thirties accorded some degree of respect. But as the earlier breadth of an original Slavophilism narrowed down into a chauvinistic Panslavism, with its blind contempt for the West and blind admiration of Russia, there developed an ideological camp which by the Sixties was at war with the main tradition of the intelligentsia, which was itself further crystallized by such pressures of intellectual opposition.

The example of Slavophilism as an emerging "heretical" movement within the intelligentsia is only one of the clearer illustrations of intellectual cleavage. Out of the names of eminent Russian intellectuals of the nineteenth century, a whole series might be compiled of those who stood, or came to stand, at odds with a more and more compactly formed intelligentsia tradition. Some of

these—Gogol', Apollon Grigor'ev, Tjutčev, Dostoevskij, Leont'ev—form a camp of outright opposition. A middle group might also be formed, comprising those who, like Puškin, Turgenev, Čexov, actively shared the partisan attitudes of neither the intelligentsia nor their enemies. The decision as to where any particular intellectual shall be considered to stand is, of course, to a large degree arbitrary. But this does not affect the fact that the intelligentsia, as the bearers of an evolving tradition of revolutionary thought, were partly balanced in Russian intellectual life by important figures and groups who did not share or who expressly repudiated their basic assumptions. Indeed, this latter party of the opposition included within its membership perhaps the most distinguished minds and personalities of the century.

If intelligentsia is to be defined, then, by an ideological tradition, of which only certain Russian intellectuals—hardly even the most distinguished—became the active bearers, how is that tradition to be defined? Its definition involves nothing less complex than a whole major segment of modern Russian intellectual history, comprising currents and counter-currents, an emphasis shifting from one decade to the next, and a gallery of highly diverse and often bizarre personalities. Moreover, the intellectual tradition of the radical intelligentsia was by its very nature unspecific, unformulated, unfixed—even though elaborated at great length by some of the most prolix publicists the literary world has ever produced. The movement of thought within the intelligentsia was by nature exploratory, sensitive to every intellectual wind from Europe, alert to the changing history of both Russia and the West. For all their dogmatism at every stage, some of the most energetic minds of the intelligentsia passed from one ideological stage often to its extreme opposite, in their insistent search for a total system which should somehow resolve all the largest questions of national destiny.

Yet in spite of individual variations and shifting trends, it is possible to detect certain main currents which continued to carry

the thought of the intelligentsia along. So cohesive, in fact, is the complex of attitudes and positions that one is constantly teased into finding a name for it. A possible description, one part of which would have pleased and another part outraged the members of the intelligentsia, is egocentric humanism. Such a generalized description might at least serve here to introduce more particular features of this ideological complex.

Human rights
The intelligentsia had its immediate beginnings in that awakening of national consciousness in Russia which received its first impulse at the time of the Russian defeat of Napoleon and the subsequent entry of the Russian armies into the West. It is significant that the first concrete repercussion within Russia of that historic contact with the West was revolt, in 1825. From the outset, concern with the problems of Russian nationhood led directly to dissatisfaction with the status quo. And that dissatisfaction always sprang from the charge that the status quo was grounded upon the violation of human rights. Serfdom was only the most dramatic among the crimes of the social order against humanity. The subjugation of women, for example, was another outrage. But more than any single injustice was the fact that authority was unenlightened, and the exercise of power—by definition, in an unjust order—entailed the suppression of human freedom.

Meanwhile, the most influential thought of the West provided Russian indignation with extensive arguments in defense of Man and Freedom. The eighteenth-century Enlightenment, dramatized by the French Revolution, constituted a whole epoch to which Russian humanitarianism could turn for confirmation. German philosophic thought, particularly that of Kant, Schelling, and Hegel (especially as interpreted by the Hegelians of the Left), so fascinated its Russian students with its celebration of the free life of the human spirit that the Twenties and Thirties and Forties in Russia were marked by a series of joyful conversions to German philosophic systems. Černyševskij, the hero of the Sixties, never stopped paying his respects to Feuerbach for his convincing

demonstration in Das Wesen des Christentums that man is himself the divinity which he worships. To such German philosophic systematization, French and also English socialist thought added its exposition of the ideal of a free human society. The "totalness" of both German philosophic thought and French social theory carried a direct appeal to Russian critics of a social order which they were convinced could be made creative only by being ruthlessly overturned and refashioned. *but without that previous work - method*

In the West, the cult of human freedom, supported and systematized by a long tradition of Western humanism, remained for the most part compatible with programs of liberal reform and constitutional change. But the same ideals which motivated liberalism in the West had the efficacy of dynamite in the combustible atmosphere of nineteenth-century Russia. Even the most revolutionary ideas, even the most radical efforts at reform could, moreover, work themselves out in the West, where a more stable culture provided an enduring basis for change. But in nineteenth-century Russia, built like a house of cards, the first wind of radical doctrine was liable to destroy the whole unsteady structure. The principle of human freedom, with such corollaries as legal process, universal suffrage, constitutional amendment, was the very cornerstone of democratic liberalism in the West. That same principle, preached by a handful of intellectuals held captive between an oppressive official regime and a popular mass of deaf-mutes, provided the basis of an orientation to social and cultural problems which was foreign to all the presuppositions of liberalism. The same doctrines that inspired liberalism in the West inspired nihilism in Russia. Where there is at least the hope that authority may be benevolent, it is possible to trust in legal reform. But where the existing order provides no hope of change and no channels through which change might operate, then the very concept of authority inspires only moral indignation. This is the gist of Russian nihilism, which rejected not only a particular authority but all traditional authority as such.

The fully consistent radical rejection of authority as such is, of course, anarchy. And Russian nihilists like Bakunin tried to make anarchy systematic. But anarchy is only one extreme direction of Russian nihilism. The mainstream of nihilism turned toward more constructive means by which the old authority might be replaced: first and foremost, to science. The cult of science—first natural science and later, especially with the advent of Marxism, social science—among the intelligentsia was so religiously practiced and believed in because science seemed to offer the only solid method by which a whole new intellectual order and a whole new social order could be built. In science the Russian radical critic sought intellectual dogma, a systematic structure of intellectual principle upon which to found the new truth which should replace the spurious authority of the traditional. The appeal of science, as he conceived it, lay in its incontrovertible certainty, and at the same time in the fact that it could be made to cover the whole of life. For a while, during the Thirties and Forties, this search for a total system had ended in Hegel. But "science" made a much larger appeal than any individual philosophic system, for it was the intellectual structure of reality itself.

What fascinated the intelligentsia about science is the same thing that fascinated them about Schelling or Hegel: by gaining possession of "the truth," the intelligentsia vindicated their existence in a social order in which they were continually threatened by futility, by being "superfluous men." Effectively cut off from functional participation in the life of the community, they secretly built, by the power of the mind alone, a truth to which only the "enlightened" held the key. They were the only true "realists," as Pisarev announced. They alone understood in what direction history was moving.

Such trust in their own intellectual understanding, in the power of rational "science" to penetrate through the façade of hypocritical tradition into the solid rock of material reality obliterated among the intelligentsia any remnant of a religious sense of life. By the

very character of the influences which formed them, they could have no faith in any providential order other than the order which they might build for themselves. As for the traditional religion represented by the Orthodox Church, it was utterly defunct in their experience of it. But they were irreligious in a far profounder sense than is indicated even by their contemptuous hostility toward all ecclesiastical authority: their entire experience conspired to make them men without faith. The only sense of community they knew was with those who belonged to their own intellectual elite, with whom they shared an intellectual agreement. It is in this sense that their humanism became "egocentric"; Man, always the professed hero of the intelligentsia, was narrowed down to an increasingly partisan definition, which only the chosen few considered themselves enlightened enough to make. And by their definition, of course, man was ideally he who expressed those qualities which the intelligentsia respected.

It is compulsory for the revolutionary thinker to claim for himself an understanding of the true nature of man. For it is in the name of man, in some sense "natural man," loosed from the formative pressures of the existing culture, that the old order is to be destroyed. For all its trust in "scientific" and "rational" criticism of existing institutions, the thought of the intelligentsia thus continued to behold a utopian vision of a future in which unfettered, unconventionalized self-interest would find its natural expression, in a society so whole that the self-interest of each would naturally conduce to the interest of all. So deep was the trust of the intelligentsia in the natural force which they felt to be gathering behind them, as it were, that their thought moved easily from being merely progressivist to taking on an apocalyptic character. They thought of themselves as holding, by their true understanding of material reality, the power to rally and unleash a human force to which the future inevitably belonged. Their enthusiasm lay in the conviction that they knew where history was going and that it was going in a direction which they heartily

endorsed.

Although intellectuals to the core, the members of the intelligentsia regarded even intellectual activity in the light of a reality which was also the foundation of a social and political cause. That is to say, their thinking was consistently ideological. "Pure" science or "pure" art, the disinterested pursuit of knowledge or beauty, was by their view not only idle but essentially trivial, since it was not seriously committed to that cause of human truth and freedom of which they considered themselves the enlightened sponsors. Even as early as Belinskij the attack upon "pure" knowledge was declared. Černyševskij argued that in his day the pursuit of knowledge should give place, even in the world of scholarship, to the dissemination of knowledge already established.

Such a utilitarian conception of the role of the intellectual is a natural part of the thought of an elite whose own intellectual activity was entirely devoted to a radical criticism of their society. From its beginnings the thought of the intelligentsia was inspired, not by the disinterested pleasures of the mind, but by an earnest, oftener a grim pursuit of an intellectual system which should provide the key to the problems of existence in the nineteenth-century Russian world. Intelligentsia, as a word, for all its vagueness, aptly suggests this central character of the Russian revolutionary movement: [that the revolutionary vanguard was a particular group of men who sought in an intellectual system of their own devising (even if largely out of borrowed materials) a total structure of reality which should entirely replace the order within which they were condemned to live.] Intelligentsia is far more expressive than a more abstract phrase like "revolutionary movement," for example, for it points to a concrete group of individuals whose lives and fortunes within the Russia of their time made their tradition of thought what it was. Much of the power as well as the direction of Russian revolutionary thought came out of the fact that an oppressive official order frustrated and repressed a tiny group of men who constituted something like the moral conscience

of the nation, and who consumed a major portion of the intellectual energies of Russia throughout a century in the desperate enterprise of creating an entire new order of reality in their heads.¹

Note

1. I should like to acknowledge my obligation to the Russian Research Center of Harvard University for sponsoring my research in the pre-Revolutionary Russian intelligentsia.

RUSSIAN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE THROUGH PARTY-COLORED SPECTACLES

By Gleb Struve

University of California

The campaign against "cosmopolitanism," "servility before the West," and "bourgeois formalism," launched by Soviet leaders in the autumn of 1946,¹ had a considerable effect on Soviet literary scholarship. Many of the leading scholars, especially those concerned with the problem of Russia's literary relations with the West, were attacked for their "cosmopolitan" attitude, their books were lambasted, they were forced to recant or to withdraw into silence.² Some of the most prominent ones (Ejxenbaum, Tomaševskij, Dolinin, Gukovskij) practically disappeared from the scene between 1946 and 1949, when the anti-West campaign reached its high peak. Others hastened to readjust themselves. Among these latter was Professor Dmitrij Blagoj, author of the standard university textbook on eighteenth-century Russian literature, the original edition of which, designed apparently to replace, or supplement, an earlier work by Professor Grigorij Gukovskij, appeared almost on the eve of the anti-West campaign.³ Blagoj brought out a new and revised edition of his textbook which was officially accepted by the Soviet Ministry of Higher Education as a textbook for Universities and Educational Institutes.⁴ These two editions are referred to below as B 1945 and B 1951.

There are numerous changes in the new text of Blagoj's book, which include stylistic improvements and factual corrections, but the most conspicuous feature of the revised edition is the persistent tendency to suppress or play down the evidence of the originally

admitted Western influences on Russian literature in the eighteenth century. Thus, in the chapter on Lomonosov, discussing the famous "Ode on the Capture of Xotin" (1739), traditionally regarded as the starting point of modern Russian poetry, Blagoj originally wrote:

Lomonosov did not create a new poetic genre. In the genre of the eulogistic ode, chosen by him, he followed the tradition of his immediate precursor Boileau, of the father of French classicism Malherbe, and of the accepted European models. To the French model—Boileau's famous ode on the capture of Namur, of which Tred'jakovskij had made such a painstaking use in his ode on the surrender of Gdansk—Lomonosov added another one, namely the ode of the German poet Günther, which enjoyed great favor in Germany, on an almost identical subject—the conclusion of peace between Austria and Turkey which took place twenty-one years earlier than the capture of Xotin, viz., in 1718.⁵

In the revised edition of Blagoj's book the whole of this passage has been suppressed, and Lomonosov's indebtedness to his Western predecessors and contemporaries in general belittled.

The same tendency runs through the whole of the revised edition. Thus, originally, in discussing Sumarokov's dramatic work, Blagoj wrote that his comedies, especially those of the earlier period, were full of farcical episodes, sometimes of a frankly slapstick nature, and that Sumarokov had not only used as models such plays of Molière as Les Fourberies de Scapin but owed even more to the traditional lazzi of the Italian commedia dell'arte. In support of this statement Blagoj mentioned that Sumarokov had often seen those Italian comedies performed at the court of Empress Anna, adding: "The problem of the Italian commedia dell'arte as one of the sources of Sumarokov's comedy has not been so far made a subject of special research, but the influence itself is quite unquestionable."⁶ In the revised edition Molière's influence is briefly alluded to, but there is not a word about that of the Italian commedia dell'arte.⁷

If we look at the chapter on Fonvizin, we shall see that this

is what Blagoj wrote about Fonvizin's Brigadier in 1945:

Later scholars (Tixonravov, Aleksej Veselovskij) had succeeded in finding for The Brigadier a Western European parallel—Holberg's comedy Jean de France, which enjoyed great popularity. Not long before The Brigadier, an adaptation of Holberg's comedy had had a run on the Russian stage. This adaptation was from the pen of none other than Elagin and was of course very well known both to Fonvizin and to the numerous first audiences of The Brigadier.⁸

Blagoj went on to say that this did not interfere with the success of Fonvizin's play or with the general recognition of the fact that its characters were in full conformity with Russian realities. Yet, in 1951 the passage was completely revised to read as follows: "The attempt of some earlier scholars to question the originality of The Brigadier by proclaiming it to be an imitation of Holberg's comedy Jean de France does not hold water. Its connection with Holberg's play is purely external."⁹

To a more thorough revision was subjected the chapter on Radiščev who is now being more and more dressed up by Soviet scholars as an out-and-out revolutionary thinker, a "critical realist" (rather than a "sentimentalist") and a vigorous debunker of the "sham" of Western European and American democracy.

In the original edition, speaking of Radiščev's style, Blagoj wrote that many pages of his Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow "are written in a Biblical-prophetic style," and that the same "Biblical array" had been used by the English and American revolutionaries (this statement was propped up by a quotation from Marx and Engels)—those revolutionaries "of whom Radiščev was an excited and enthusiastic admirer." Blagoj then went on to point out that Radiščev could have found the same Biblical array in the writings of Milton ("the greatest writer of the English Revolution") and of Klopstock whose Messiad he "highly valued." Continuing, Blagoj wrote:

But next to the masterpieces of European sentimentalism and pre-romanticism—the works of Rousseau, the Sentimental Journey of Sterne, The Sufferings of Young Werther of

Goethe—Radiščev himself named another book that served him, as it were, as a direct school for training the style which he needed and which suited best the ideological and artistic requirements of the Journey. This was Raynal's History of the Two Indies.

There followed a passage describing Raynal's book as "one of the most radical works of French Enlightenment," a work avidly read by Benjamin Franklin ("whom Radiščev esteemed so much") and proclaimed by Toussaint l'Ouverture to be his gospel. Raynal's book, wrote Blagoj,

written in accents of forceful and bold civic rhetoric and lofty emotional pathos, . . . had produced an extraordinary impression on Radiščev. The oratorical heightening and grandeur of style, which Radiščev had so much admired in the works of Lomonosov, was at the same time colored in Raynal's book by the "sensibility" so dear to Radiščev, by the emotional sympathy with the sufferings of oppressed humanity. . . . The colossal popularity of Raynal's work confirmed, in Radiščev's eyes, the enormous appeal of its linguistic equipment. All this induced Radiščev, according to his own admission, to learn directly from Raynal, whose name is more than once mentioned in the Journey, his style. In his "Discourse" on Lomonosov, Radiščev had envisioned—probably with himself in mind—an orator who, while himself a "pupil" of Lomonosov, being oversated with the abundant eloquence of his eulogistic discourses, would "thunder out" in a different style. It was with the help of Raynal that Radiščev was able to impart to Lomonosov's lofty style a social-revolutionary function that was alien to it.¹⁰

In the revised edition Blagoj writes:

While trying in self-defense to stress the predominantly literary, rather than political, character of his book, Radiščev himself, in his testimony during the preliminary investigation, referred to two literary sources which he said he had followed as models—Sterne's Sentimental Journey and one of the most radical works of French Enlightenment, the History of the Two Indies by the Abbé Raynal. . . . Many bourgeois scholars took on trust this statement of Radiščev's, forgetting the special circumstances under which it was made and the tactical object which it pursued. Yet, in fact, there is nothing 'imitative' in Radiščev's book. . . . It is true that Radiščev's book belongs to the same genre of travel books' the beginnings of which were laid by Sterne's Sentimental Journey. But this genre was adopted by Radiščev not because

he wished to imitate Sterne, but because the compositional form of a travelogue ... suited best the task which Radiščev had set before himself in his book.¹¹

By 1951, Blagoj seems to have forgotten that, like "many bourgeois scholars," he had also taken "on trust" Radiščev's statements about the extraordinary impression made on him by Raynal's book. Now, speaking of Radiščev's "Biblical-prophetic style," Blagoj mentions Lomonosov's influence, but makes no reference to Milton, the English Puritans, or Klopstock. Nor is there a word to be found about his "going to school" to Raynal for his style.

On the other hand, emphasizing the "democratic and revolutionary nature of Radiščev's thought," Blagoj maintains that "it becomes particularly clear and obvious if we compare it with the Western European Enlightenment of the eighteenth century." Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and especially Mably (whom Radiščev translated) all appear "anti-democratic" when compared with Radiščev. The latter's distinctly negative attitude toward the "disgraceful" aspects of the American scene ("the inalienable part of which was the cruel extermination of the Indians and the oppression of the Negroes on the part of the bigoted and hypocritical Anglo-American 'civilizers'") is underlined, while not a word is breathed about Radiščev's effusive worship of the American Revolution and its leaders.¹²

In the chapters on Novikov's satirical journals and on Karamzin the changes are less drastic, but there is also a general playing down of foreign influences, or at least of their beneficial effects,¹³ and a general condemnation of Karamzin's youthful "cosmopolitanism" has been added in a passage dealing with the subsequent evolution of his views: "Karamzin's love for his country ... was of a pronouncedly conservative character... Nevertheless it was better than his original cosmopolitanism and had a positive effect on his subsequent literary activity."¹⁴

Even more striking are perhaps the changes which Blagoj made in the valuable introductory chapter entitled "Historiography

of Russian Eighteenth Century Literature."¹⁵ In the original version of it he paid a handsome tribute to the great Russian nineteenth-century scholar Aleksandr Veselovskij (1838-1906), describing him as one of the most remarkable representatives of Russian literary scholarship and a man who exerted a great and fruitful influence on a number of other literary scholars by his attempt at setting up "historical poetics" and his broad treatment of problems of style. To his influence was ascribed the fact that in recent times the center of interest in the study of eighteenth-century Russian literature had shifted from the investigation of a few representative figures, so typical of pre-revolutionary scholarship, to that of the genesis and history of different literary genres, thus involving a number of second-rate and neglected authors.¹⁶

In the new edition the whole of this passage has been struck out. This is understandable, if one remembers that in 1947 Aleksandr Veselovskij was denounced for his "bourgeois formalism," his "cosmopolitanism," and his "servility before the West," and that many leading Soviet scholars were accused of following in his footsteps.¹⁷ These included Professor Grigorij Gukovskij, the author of the best History of Eighteenth-Century History of Russian Literature¹⁸ and of several books and numerous essays on the individual writers of that period. In the first edition of Blagoj's book there were numerous references to Gukovskij's writings, to be found in the said introductory chapter, in the bibliography to it, and in the bibliographies to individual chapters. In the introductory chapter, Volume IX-X of Literaturnoe Nasledstvo and the long survey article in it by Gukovskij were mentioned as the most striking evidence of the revival of interest in the eighteenth-century literature after the Revolution.¹⁹ In the new edition all these references to Gukovskij and his works have disappeared. Not one of his books or articles is listed throughout the book. For the original eulogy of Gukovskij's survey in Literaturnoe Nasledstvo a brief reference to that volume has been

substituted, with no mention of Gukovskij. The absence of Gukovskij's name is particularly conspicuous in the bibliographies to the chapters on Sumarokov and Radiščev, to whose study Gukovskij had made, in the 1920's and 1930's, a very substantial contribution. As Blagoj himself wrote in the first edition of his book "In the post-revolutionary period we find an ardent propagandist of Sumarokov in G. A. Gukovskij. Though obviously inclined to exaggerate his importance, he has nevertheless done very much toward the study of Sumarokov."²⁰ In the bibliography on Radiščev the following items by Gukovskij were included: his edition of Radiščev's Complete Poems (1940) and his long essay "Around Radiscev" in the volume entitled Očerki po istorii russkoj literatury i obščestvennoj mysli XVIII veka (Studies in the History of Russian Literature and Social Thought in the 18th Century, 1938). In the new edition these items have been removed, together with some others. This consistent ostracism of one of the leading Soviet scholars, long regarded as the foremost specialist in the field of Russian eighteenth-century literature and previously hailed as such by Blagoj himself, can only be explained by the fact that Gukovskij was one of the victims of the anti-West campaign of the late forties. He seems to have disappeared completely from the academic and literary scene, but his personal fate is not known.

P. S. The above article was written late in 1955, before the sensational developments at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party, which have led to what has been described by foreign observers as a "liberalization" on the cultural front. There is no denying a radical change of attitude toward the West and its culture on the part of Soviet scholars as a result of the new Party line and new directives. Today, attitudes similar to those of Blagoj in his textbook are being denounced as distortions in the Soviet press itself, though the present writer has not yet come across any specific refutation of Blagoj's assertions, and Blagoj

himself occupies, more than ever, a place of authority in Soviet literary scholarship. There is no doubt that, in the light of what has been going on recently and of the continuing process of "de-Stalinization", Blagoj will have to bring out a new edition of his book or a new history of eighteenth-century Russian literature will have to be written. It will be interesting to watch whether in the process Professor Gukovskij will be restored to his former status (this has happened already—mostly posthumously—to a number of writers denounced under Stalin as enemies of the people). But the facts described above cannot be deleted from the annals of Soviet literary scholarship.

By the end of 1955 new trends in Soviet literary scholarship became apparent. In September of that year the journal Voprosy Istorii (Problems of History), published by the Historical Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, carried a significant editorial article entitled "On Some Problems of the History of Russian Social Thought at the End of the Eighteenth and in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century."²¹ Among the serious defects of many recent historical works the article mentioned "the tendency to embellish reality, to remove its inherent contradictions, to adapt arbitrarily certain facts to a specific point of view" (p. 4). Authors of such works were accused of proceeding "not from objective reality, not from historical facts, but from subjective motives, from falsely understood interests of politics [*iz ložno ponjatyx interesov politiki*], whereby harm is caused to both politics and scholarship" (ib.). Among the eighteenth-century writers and thinkers thus "misrepresented" in recent works a prominent place was given to Novikov and Radiščev: "Desirous of 'improving' the views of the outstanding Russian eighteenth-century enlightener N. I. Novikov, G. P. Makogonenko, P. N. Berkov, and others try to prove that Novikov never was a Freemason. But why gloss over and whitewash Novikov's fallacies? His Freemasonry had its social and ideological roots . . ." In a more general way the article stressed the widespread tendency to isolate

Russian literature and thought from Western European and American developments:

In examining the evolution of social thought, its student must proceed from an analysis of the specific historical situation in a given country, of the social and national milieu in which the ideas studied by him had originated. Yet he cannot but study the far-reaching bonds between those ideas and the life of ideas and political struggle outside the boundaries of that country. One cannot imagine Lomonosov's outlook outside its connection with the whole of European culture; one cannot understand Radiščev without studying the struggle of ideas in Europe, the North American emancipation movement, and the French bourgeois revolution. The views of Russian revolutionary democrats are closely tied up with German philosophy, with the doctrines of the great French and English Utopian Socialists. (Pp. 4-5).

This "obvious truth" was ignored by many Soviet scholars, said the article in Voprosy Istorii.

As is often the case in the Soviet Union, the article was taken by scholars as a kind of "directive" and had various repercussions. One of them was a discussion held on November 10, 1955, at the Institute of Russian Literature of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, in which several well-known scholars took part, including some whose work had been criticized by Voprosy Istorii. A detailed account of this discussion appeared in the Bulletin of the Literature and Language Section of the Academy.²² The necessity of widening the scope of problems raised by Voprosy Istorii and of extending the criticisms to the study of the second half of the nineteenth century was stressed by Dr. V. G. Bazanov. The following statement of his deserves to be quoted:

It is necessary to raise anew the problem of literary ties between Russian and foreign writers, to give a more precise appraisal of the theory of so-called 'influences.' In recent years a primitive approach to this theory has led to the result that this problem is no longer studied at all. In connection with the working out of the problem of comparative historical study of literature, a calm and truly scholarly historical and critical examination of the legacy and methodology of Aleksandr Veselovskij is needed, instead of passing his activity in silence or denigrating it wholesale.

The "nihilistic" attitude to the heritage of Veselovskij and other pre-revolutionary Russian scholars (Potebnja, Buslaev) was also denounced by V. E. Gusev. Dr. V. A. Desnickij, one of those who in 1947-49 were accused of "Veselovskijism," spoke of the harm which the erroneous conception of "cosmopolitanism" and the utter neglect of the international ties of Russian literature had done in recent years to the study of Puškin, whose work "was completely isolated from the best attainments of Western European culture." The desirability of reporting foreign scholarly publications and foreign dissertations about Russian literature in the Bulletin of the Literature and Language Section was voiced by Dr. P. N. Berkov, one of those scholars whose works on eighteenth-century Russian literature were criticized by Voprosy Istorii. There were also specific attacks on various recent works about Radiščev, including those of Blagoj, Vilenskaja, Ščipanov, Makogonenko, and Prikazčikova. "Radiščev," said D. S. Babkin, "cannot be studied apart from revolutionary events in France."

The same problems were further ventilated at the annual conference of the Literature and Language Section of the Academy of Sciences on January 31, 1956. In his report to the conference the Secretary of the Section, the eminent linguist Professor Vinogradov mentioned "the slackening of interest in the problem of interrelations between Russian and foreign literatures" as one of the serious shortcomings of Soviet literary scholarship.²³

It is clear that a new revision of history, including the history of literature, is proceeding apace in the Soviet Union. Its fruits in literary scholarship are to be awaited with interest. But it must be borne in mind that the methods by which this revision is being carried out still smack too much of totalitarian conformism.

Notes

1. For an account of this anti-West campaign see Gleb Struve, Soviet Russian Literature: 1917-1950 (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951), pp. 329-353.

2. For some details and names see Struve, Soviet Russian Literature, especially pp. 338-343; also, Robert M. Hankin, "Post-war Soviet Ideology and Literary Scholarship," in Through the Glass of Soviet Literature: Views of Russian Society, ed. by Ernest J. Simmons (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), pp. 244-289.

3. D. D. Blagoj, Istorija ruskoj literatury XVIII veka (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Nar-komprosa RSFSR, 1945 [this date is given on the title-page; the date on the cover is 1946; the book was signed for the press on June 19, 1945]).

4. D. D. Blagoj, Istorija ruskoj literatury XVIII veka (Izdanie 2-oe, pererabotannoe, Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva Prosveščeniya RSFSR, 1951).

5. B 1945, p. 123. In a review of Blagoj's book in the Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie (XX, 184-86) Professor M. Vasmer regretfully pointed out that in the case of Lomonosov and some other writers Blagoj was deliberately playing down German influences. Vasmer attributed this to war-time psychology.

6. B 1945, pp. 168-169.

7. B 1951, pp. 244-246. A tendency to play down foreign influences is felt also in the general discussion of Russian classicism at the beginning of Part II of the book: cf. B 1945, pp. 74-79, and B 1951, pp. 111-119.

8. B 1945, p. 232. I. P. Elagin was a well-known statesman and man of letters, who was in charge of the Russian theatres at the time, and under whom Fonvizin served for a while.

9. B 1951, p. 352.

10. B 1945, pp. 367-368. The underscoring is mine. The full title of Raynal's book was Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1770). A little earlier in his original edition Blagoj wrote: "In obvious violation of all the rules obtaining at the time in our literature and in the first place of those of Lomonosov, and at the same time in the wake of the new European 'examples' (Rousseau, Sterne, Goethe, Raynal), Radiščev wrote also his Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow" (B 1945, p. 366).

11. B 1951, pp. 583-584. The underscoring is my own.

12. B 1951, pp. 578-579.

13. Compare B 1945, pp. 390-391, and B 1951, p. 640.

14. B 1951, p. 643.

15. B 1945, pp. 5-17; B 1951, pp. 10-31. (There is actually

as much, if not more, material in this section in B 1945, owing to the smaller type used.

16. B 1945, p. 13.

17. For details of the attack on "Veselovskijism" see Hankin. For Veselovskij's influence on Soviet literary scholarship before World War II, see my article "Comparative Literature Studies in the Soviet Union, Today and Yesterday," in Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature, IV (1955), 1-20.

18. G. A. Gukovskij, Istorija ruskoj literatury XVIII veka (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo, 1939). Gukovskij's book is in many ways superior to Blagoj's (even to B 1945). It was very favorably reviewed by Professor D. Cizevsky in Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, XVII, 469-474.

19. B 1945, p. 15.

20. B 1945, p. 177.

21. "O nekotoryx voprosax istorii ruskoj obščestvennoj mysli konca XVIII pervoj poloviny XIX veka," Voprosy Istorii, No. 9, September 1955, pp. 3-12.

22. "V Institute ruskoj literatury AN SSSR," Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR—Otdelenie literatury i jazyka, XV (1956), 193-196.

23. "Godičnoe sobranie Otdelenija literatury i jazyka Akademii Nauk SSSR," ibid., pp. 183-192.

GORAL SONGS RECORDED IN CANADA

By J. B. Rudnyčkyj

University of Manitoba

Among the Polish settlers in Canada there are representatives of various dialectal groups from different parts of Poland, such as Warszawiacy, Krakowiacy, Poznaniacy, Podhalanie, Ślązacy, and others. The most genuine and unmixed group which I found on my ethno-dialectological trip in 1953¹ was that of the Kashubian settlers at Wilno and its environs in Eastern Ontario.² At Redcliff, Alberta, I met some representatives of the sub-Tatra ("Podhale") region, the so-called "Goral" people from the district of Limanowa, southeast of Cracow. I recorded several texts from Mr. Józef Bulanda, age 59, and Mrs. Anna Bulanda, age 57, nee Wojtowicz. Both of them have been immigrants in Canada since 1927, from the village of Sowliny, near Limanowa. Another speaker was Mr. Wincenty Gawron, an educated painter and ethnographer, in whose hospitable home the recordings were made. Mr. Gawron, in addition, took down several songs from Stara Wieś, near Limanowa, and he has kindly placed them at my disposal.

The complete Canadian-Slavic material will be published in my projected "Slavic Languages and Dialects in Canada." Part of this material has already been published in the following volumes: Ukrainian Canadian Folklore and Dialectological Texts (Winnipeg: UVAN, 1956), and Canadian Slavic Namelore (Studies in Onomastics, I, Winnipeg: Onomastica UVAN, 1956). A full account of my activities in this field is given in my survey, "Ukrainian and Other Slavic Recordings in Canada in 1949-56," Instituts de

Phonétique et Archives phonographiques, ed. by Sever Pop (Publications de la Commission d'Enquête linguistique, VII, Louvain: Commission d'Enquête linguistique, 1956), pp. 355-359. I hope that similar field work will be done in collecting folk songs and traditions among the several groups of Slavic extraction in the United States, and that the materials will be published.

The texts are presented here in the usual phonetic transcription, with parallel forms in literary Polish, and with a (bracketed) literal prose translation into English.

1. A Sunset Song from Sowliny

Syonecko na zaxoże,
Żefcyno otprovaż m'ie.

Otprovaż m'ie za las
A iā će drugi ras,
I tāk će rozejżemy.

A iāg my će rogstajal'i,
Założnie zapuakal'i

Obaj do jednego
Fartuska b'iałego
Założnie uezki vyl'eval'i.

Słoneczko na zachodzie,
Dziewczyno odprowadź mnie.

Odprowadź mnie za las,
A ja cię drugi raz,
I tak się rozejdziemy.

A jak my się rozstajali,
Żałożnie zapłakali

Obaj do jednego
Fartuszka białego
Żałożnie łezki wylewali.

(Sung by Mrs. Anna Bulanda, at Redcliff, Alberta, May 31, 1953)

[Translation: The sun is setting. Accompany me, dear maiden, beyond the woods, and I shall come back with you. And then we shall part. And as we parted we wept bitterly, both on the same white apron: we shed bitter tears.]

2. Goral Songs (Pieśni góralskie)

I

Hej gural' iā se gural',
Hej spot sām'iuśk'ik tater,
Hej descyk m'ie vykośkau,
Hej vykouysau v'iat'er.

Hej, góral ja se góral,
Hej, spod samiuśkich Tater,
Hej, deszczyk mnie wykośkał,
Hej, wykołysał wiater.

Gural'u od Zyfca,
 Płozyc m'je k'yrpce,
 Iã ci ñe popsuję,
 A tyl'ko potańcuje.

Góralu od Żywca,
 Pożycz mnie kierzpcę,
 Ja ci nie popsuję,
 A tylko potańcuję.

(Sung by Mrs. Anna Bulanda, at Redcliff, Alberta, May 31, 1953)

[Translation: I am a real Goral-mountaineer from Tatra itself: the rain raised me, and the wind brought me up. You, mountaineer from Żywiec, give me your moccasins. I shall not spoil them, only dance a while in them.]

II

Oj iije gural'ina,
 Neşe fl'aske vina,
 Na še k'yrpce, k'yrpce,
 Oj iije iije ku frajyrce.

Oj, idzie góralina,
 Niesie flaszczę wina,
 Na się kierzpcę, kierzpcę,
 Oj, idzie, idzie ku frajerce.

Oj gural'u, gural'u,
 Matka ci umarła,
 Co ci jej stało?
 Oj fcora kl'usk'i zarła.

Oj, góralu, góralu,
 Matka ci umarła,
 Co się jej stało?
 Oj, wczora kluski żarła.

Oj ñe tãg m'i matk'i zãl;
 Oj iãg m'i kl'useg l'uto,
 Com jik ñe zjãt i
 Byłyby na jutro.

Oj, nie tak mi matki żal,
 Oj, jak mi klusek luto,
 Com ich nie zjadł i
 Byłyby na jutro.

(Sung by Mrs. Anna Bulanda, at Redcliff, Alberta, May 31, 1953)

[Translation: A mountaineer is coming and bringing a bottle of wine. He is wearing moccasins and is going to his girl friend. O mountaineer, mountaineer, your mother has died. What happened to her? Yesterday she stuffed herself on dumplings. I do not regret my mother's passing away; I regret the dumplings awfully. I did not eat them, and they would have been good for tomorrow.]

3. Song from Zakopane
(Zakopiańska)

Ja se l'igom pot kol'ibom, Xoŕig do mñe xoŕig do mñe Cårny cygån.	Ja se ligam pod kolibą, Chodził do mnie, chodził do mnie Czarny cygan.
Cårny cygån, cårneŷ śl'ep'ie, Jaŕg' ja Ź usne, jaŕg' ja usne, Ŭon mñe scyp'ie.	Czarny cygan, czarne ślepie, Jak ja usnę, jak ja usnę, On mnie szczypie.
Xoŭ ze jino po francusku, Čšymaŭ zeŕ io, čšymaŭ zeŕ io Na űaŭncusku.	Chodźże ino po francusku, Trzymaj że ją, trzymaj że ją, Na łańcuszku.
Diabl'i k ċi io učšymaŭio, K'edyk śe ie, k'edyk śe ie Nap'ieraŭio.	Diabli ci ją utrzymają, Kiedy ci je, kiedy ci je Napierają.
Pšyŭ ze do mñe ġemby ċi dām, Jescek ċi śe, jescek ċi śe Na co pšydām.	Przyjdźże do mnie ġemby ci dam, Jeszcze ci się, jeszcze ci się Na coś przydam.

(Sung by Mrs. Anna Bulanda, at Redcliff, Alberta, May 31, 1953)

[Translation: I am lying at the hut. A swarthy gypsy visited me, a swarthy gypsy, a dark-eyed gypsy. When I fell asleep, he pinched me. Walk in the French manner, but hold her on a leash. (Only) devils can hold her when (men) crowd around her. Come to me: I'll give you a kiss, and maybe I'll be of use to you some time.]

4. A Song About Janosik
(O Janosiku)

[Explanatory note: According to a Tatra legend, the ciupaga (a combination of a walking stick and a hatchet) of Janosik, the Robin Hood of the Tatra, had the power, it is said, to multiply

the regiments of the army, and the shepherd's belt which he owned had the power of making him invisible when it was necessary. The lords of Liptow, whom Janosik plundered mercilessly, learned of it, and they planned to catch him asleep. Thus they hired a girl to lure the fellow to her house, and there, when Janosik fell asleep, she took his belt and his ciupaga. And as a result, the Hungarian magnates, who were on watch, easily took him. Some time before that, Janosik had danced with the Empress Maria Theresa, whom he had attracted very much, and who was to enlist him in her army, because he, his ciupaga, and belt together were equal to a regiment of soldiers.]

Here is a Goral song on the theme of Janosik, as recorded in Polish literary spelling by Mr. W. Gawron in Redcliff, Alberta, in August 1953:

Co się stało, Boze, w bardyjowym dworze,
 Ułapili Janosika z dziewczynom w komorze.
 Jak go ułapili, tak go i związali,
 I do miasta Mikulasa odprowadzić dali.
 Liptoscy pankowie piyknie go witali:
 Witaj ptosku, Janosicku, juz my cie złapali.
 Liptoscy pankowie, prose wos piyrsy roz,
 Dejcie ze mi ciupazecke, do rucki jesce roz.
 Łoni mu nie dali, bo sie łobowiali,
 I łoni mu ciupazecki do rucki nie dali.
 Liptoscy pankowie prose wos drugi roz,
 Dejcie ze mi łopasik mój, łopasać jesce roz.
 Łoni mu nie dali, bo sie łobowiali,
 I łoni mu łopasika łopasać nie dali.
 Liptoscy pankowie, prose wos jesce roz,
 Dejcie mi zbójnickiego zatańceć jesce roz.
 Łoni mu juz dali, bo sie go nie boli,
 I łoni mu zbójnickiego zatańceć kozali.
 Janosik tańcuje, cygon mu basuje,
 A śmiertecka-kochanecka welo niego boćkuje.

A kiedy Janosik zbójnickiego skończył,
Posył ci na siubienicke i tam życie skończył.
Juz lo Janosika robią truchle z deski,
A tu idzie dekret łaski, z Widnia, łód Tereski.
Przysed dekret łaski, cyto ksiądz wikary,
Ze Janosik uwolniony łód winy i kary.
Liptoscy pankowie barz sie potropili,
Bo co rok za Janosika ćwierć śrybła płacili.
Janosika imię nigdy nie zaginie,
Ani na wyrsycku, ani na dolinie.

[Translation: Oh, God, what happened in the manor of Bar-
dyjow: Janosik was caught with a girl in a room. When they
caught him, they bound him and had him taken to the city of Miku-
las. The magnates of Liptow welcomed him nicely: "Welcome
ye, little bird, Janosik; now we have caught you." "Lords of Lip-
tow, I am begging of you for the first time: give me the ciupaga
into my hands once more." But they did not give it to him, because
they were afraid, and they did not give the ciupaga into his hand.
"Lords of Liptow, I beg of you once more: give me my belt to
gird myself once more." They did not give it to him, because they
were afraid; they did not give him his belt to gird himself about.
"Lords of Liptow, I ask you once more, let me dance a zbójnicki
dance once more." They let him dance, because they were not
afraid. And they ordered him to dance the zbójnicki-dance. Jano-
sik is dancing, a gypsy is playing, and darling death is dancing
beside him. And when Janosik finished his zbójnicki-dance he
went to the gallows and finished his life there. A coffin of boards
is being made for Janosik, and suddenly a decree of mercy comes
from Theresa from Vienna. The decree came, and the high priest
is reading it. Janosik is freed from the guilt and from punishment.
The magnates from Liptow were very much troubled. They had to
pay for dead Janosik a quarter of silver per year. And so the
name of Janosik will never die, neither high on the summit nor

deep in the vale!]

Notes

1. This trip was sponsored by the University of Manitoba Research Fund, in Winnipeg, and the Humanities Research Council of Canada in Ottawa.

2. The name of Wilno was given to this settlement in the 1880's, in honor of the first priest there, the late Reverent W. Dembski, who came from the city of Wilno (in present-day Lithuania).

NOTES ON RUSSIAN ETYMOLOGIES

By Felix J. Oinas

Indiana University

1. In discussing the etymology of Russ. mituzít', mitusít' 'to see with one eye, to blink with the other,' Vasmer¹ notes: "It is difficult to connect mitusít' 'to drizzle,' Arxangel'sk (Podv.), with it." Vasmer thinks that mitusít' 'to drizzle' may be a blend of morosít' id. and mituzít' 'to see with one eye, etc.' However, mituzít', mitusít' 'to see with one eye, etc.' and mitusít' 'to drizzle' can be connected, without resorting to the hypothesis of a blend, on the grounds that the shift from "seeing dimly" to "drizzle" or vice versa is semantically quite natural. Cf. the above-mentioned Russ. morosít' 'to drizzle,' which has been connected by Walde with Russ. morgát' 'to blink the eyes, to twitch, wink' (cited in Vasmer s.v. morosít'); Estonian (Wiedemann)² (silmad) ribavad '(the eyes) swim, see in a distorted way'³ and ribu "drizzling rain."

2. The opinions of linguists on the relationship between Russ. rjúma 'epilepsy,' on one hand, and rjúma 'person of tearful nature, inclined to weeping,' rjúmit' 'to weep, cry,' on the other, have varied. Vasmer formerly⁴ connected both of them and considered them borrowings from Greek. Preobraženskij,⁵ however, insisted on separating them, considering only rjúma 'epilepsy' a borrowing from Greek, and rjúma 'person of a tearful nature' an onomatopoetic word. Vasmer's latest point of view⁶ is close to that of Preobraženskij: he also separates the two above-mentioned words as to their origin, denoting however rjúma 'epilepsy'

as 'not clear' and rjúma 'person of a tearful nature' as of onomatopoeitic origin (related to revét').

The separation of these words can, however, hardly be substantiated. We have to consider that epileptic seizures are very often accompanied by piercing cries.⁷ This is reflected also in the names of the epileptics and of epilepsy in northeastern Russ. dialects: (Dal')⁸ klfkala, klfkal'sčik, klikún, klikún'ja, klikúša 'one possessed by a kind of epilepsy, to which especially women are subjected: during the convulsions consciousness is lost and the sick person cries furiously in a bestial voice, uttering curses'; klikúšestvo 'the disease of the klikuša's'—from the verb klfkat' 'to call out, to cry wildly and to swear in the fit of the klikuša's'. See also the description of the disease of klikuša's by Dostoevskij.⁹ Considering this, it is quite natural to assume also the development of rjúma 'epilepsy' from rjúmit' 'to cry.' The latter is, as Vasmer has pointed out, most probably of onomatopoeitic origin.

3. The origin of Russ. Tver' rofki (pl.) 'two boats joined together, which are rowed by one oar' has not yet been completely clarified. Vasmer, referring to Kalima, derives it from Finnish ruuhi 'boat,' although Kalima actually left the question open.¹⁰ Kalima's doubts as to the borrowing from Finnish are not unjustified, since the regular reflex of Balto-Finnic rūh, rūhi, etc., is in Russ. rúgača, rúgači.

The Russ. rofki 'a double boat' has a homonym in the neighborhood of St. Petersburg: roičí 'simple shoes' (< Finnish).¹¹ It is probable that both of these Russ. words go back to Finnish ruoju 'a kind of short boots.' In Russ. the name for shoes was transferred to the boat, because of the strong similarity between the pair of shoes and the double boat. Cf. Middle French escafe 'small boat' and escafignon 'shoe,' in which the transfer of meaning occurred vice versa.¹²

4. Russ. Kursk skargfkat' 'to squeak (of boots),' marked

onomatopoetic by Vasmer, belongs to the noun skarga 'lament.' Cf. Estonian (slang) saapad nutavad 'the shoes squeak' (lit. 'weep').

5. Russ. skulít 'to whine (of dogs), to complain' is according to Vasmer "perhaps a blend [Kreuzung] of skólit 'to whine' and skučát id." Actually skulít is a derivation from the noun skulá 'jaw, jawbone; cheek-bone,' and originally referred to the baring of the dog's jaws. The latter meaning appears clearly with the reflexive of the same verb: (Dal') skulít'sja 'to bare one's teeth, to bare one's jaws, to snarl (of an animal).' For the semantic relationship between the verbs denoting (usually derogatory) sounds, and the nouns meaning 'jaw,' cf. Russ. dial. zevát 'to shout, cry, etc.' — zevkí (pl.) 'jaws (of man)' (Vasmer); (Dal') čávkat 'to speak sluggishly and smackingly, indistinctly, etc.' — čavkí, čávkaly (pl.) 'lower jaws' (v. also Vasmer); Estonian (Wiedemann) lõugama 'to shout, speak loud' — lõug 'chin; jaw-bone;' Engl. to jaw, and the noun jaw.

6. The Russ. noun tjuxtěj 'blockhead,' tjuxtér 'blockhead, clumsy man,' and the verb tjúxtit 'to eat slowly and much, to slurp,' tjuxtjáčit id., both marked "obscure" by Vasmer, belong obviously together. They are probably of onomatopoetic origin. For their semantic relationship, cf. Russ. (Dal') pextjúk, pextjúšnik 'slow, clumsy man; glutton,' pextjúrit 'to eat much and greedily, etc.'

7. The origin of the North Great Russ. verb vatúlit 'to say indecent things' is marked by Vasmer as "not clear." This verb belongs to the word group which in Russ. dialects expresses various derogatory terms of speaking (or working), such as (Dal') Perm vatólit, vaúlit, Vjatka vátlát 'to mumble, drawl, to speak or work slowly, to speak indistinctly, to talk nonsense, to trifle,' Perm vaúla 'tongue-tied person, stammerer, stutterer'; Siberian¹³ vátlat, vatjat 'to chat, gossip.' As for the meaning of vatúlit, 'to say indecent things,' it can be derived without difficulty from 'to talk nonsense.'

All of the above-mentioned words can be connected with vatólit 'to spin coarsely and badly,' a derivation from vatóla, vatúla 'coarse linen, upper garment,' to which also belong vatúl-ka 'woven peasant rug' (Vasmer) and vátjuški 'mittens made of woolen cloth or knitted of wool.'¹⁴ The semantic development from 'to spin, weave, knit, bind, etc.' to 'talking nonsense, talking or working slowly, etc.' is quite common in various languages; cf. Russ. vérzit 'to speak nonsense, to lie,' verztí 'to act or speak foolishly for a long time' from verzát 'to bind, tie'; splétni (pl.) 'gossip,' plestí (vzdor) 'to talk (nonsense)' from plestí 'to braid, plait, weave, spin' (Vasmer); similarly Polish pleść 'to prattle, talk nonsense' from 'to twist, braid, plait'; Estonian (Wiedemann) jamama 'to talk nonsense,' originally 'to sew or tie or draw together, to gather up (a hole in a net)'; Engl. to spin a yarn, to weave a talk.

In Tambov the verb vátlat, vátlat'sja has (according to Dal', s.v. vatóla) the meaning 'to soil oneself, etc.,' which may have developed in the following manner: 'to spin coarsely and badly' > 'to work badly and sloppily' > 'to soil oneself.'

8. Russ. (Radiščev) xvílyj 'sickly, weakly' is, according to Vasmer, a blend of xílyj 'sickly, weak' and xvóryj id. It is more plausible, however, that xvílyj goes back to the noun xvílja 'storm, humid weather, wet snow.' For the meaning, cf. Russ. dial. xíznut 'to be sickly, to wither; to become wet' from xiz 'rain with fog,' xíža 'humid weather, snow with rain' (Vasmer); Estonian (Wiedemann) vimmama 'to be sickly, to have morbid matter or an inclination toward sickness' from vihamama 'to rain,' vihmas lund 'wet snow fell' (Hakulinen).¹⁵ Hakulinen gives several more semantic parallels from the root vimm-, vihm-, viim- in various Balto-Finnic languages.

9. Russ. Don zébrik 'fishing hook,' which has no explanation so far (v. Vasmer), belongs with zebry (pl.) 'branchiae, gills; chin' of the same dialect. Cf. the following semantic parallels: Hungarian áll, which usually means 'chin,' has been attested also

in the meaning 'fishing hook, barbed hook';¹⁶ Estonian (Wiedemann) kida 'any fibre, especially muscular fibre; gills, branchiae' and also 'barbed hook'; ahingi kidad 'barbed hooks of a fish spear'; Chuvash soxa: pólâ-soxj 'gills,' which may belong with Kirgisian saxak 'the angle of the neck and chin,' saxa 'foot of a mountain.'¹⁷

Russ. (Dal') zjábra, a variant of zébraz, which occurs in southern and southwestern Russia has, in addition to the meaning 'branchiae, gills' and 'chin, jaws,' in Rjazan' also the meaning 'small hollow, dell, in which water occasionally stands.' In Živaja Starina the Rjazan' zjabra is defined as follows: 'hollow with steep banks, ravine with water in it' (cited in Vasmer, s.v. zjabra). This meaning of zjabra may have originated from the chin-like shape of the hollow (cf. Kirgisian saxa as a geographical term, above).

Notes

1. M. Vasmer, Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1953-).

2. F. J. Wiedemann, Estnisch-deutsches Wörterbuch (Tartu, 1923).

3. This verb has been borrowed from the Balto-Finnic languages by Russian: Russ. Olonec ribat', ripat' 'to blink often' (Vasmer).

4. M. Vasmer, Greko-slavjanskije štjudy (S.-Peterburg, 1909), p. 169.

5. A. Preobraženskij, Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1910-11), s.v. rjúmit'.

6. M. Vasmer, Russ. et. Wörterbuch, s.v. rjuma.

7. See e.g. L. E. Bish, Clinical Psychology (Baltimore, 1925), p. 135; W. Penfield et al., Epilepsy and Cerebral Localization (Springfield and Baltimore, 1941), pp. 68-69.

8. V. Dal', Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka (3rd ed., S.-Peterburg, 1903-9).

9. "Later on this unhappy woman [Adelaida Ivanovna], having been terrified ever since her childhood, was stricken with a kind of nervous women's disease which most frequently occurs among peasant women, who because of this disease are called

klikuša's. From this disease, connected with terrible fits of hysteria, the sick woman at times even lost her mind." (F. M. Dostoevskij, Brat'ja Karamazovy, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (S.-Peterburg, 1895), XII, 15.

10. Kalima writes: "It is difficult to say whether also the Russ. roiki, róek ... originates from this Balto-Finnic word [Vepsian ruh, pl. ruhed]. There are hardly any phonologic difficulties" (Die ostseefinnischen Lehnwörter im Russischen [Helsinki, 1919], p. 206).

11. Vasmer, following Kalima.

12. E. Gamillscheg, Französische Bedeutungslehre (Tübingen, 1951), p. 61.

13. V. Bogoraz, Oblastnoj slovar' Kolymского narečija (S.-Peterburg, 1901).

14. A. M. Astaxova, Byliny severa, II (Moskva-Leningrad, 1951), 816.

15. L. Hakulinen, Studia Fennica I (Helsinki, 1933), 90-110.

16. Z. Gombocz and J. Melich, Magyar etymologiai szótár (Budapest, 1914-).

17. M. Räsänen, Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen (Helsinki, 1920), p. 194.

PART TWO

THE CASE FOR THE SLAVIC LITERATURE COURSE IN TRANSLATION

By Leon I. Twarog

Boston University

Much concern has been voiced in recent years about the fact that courses in the non-Russian Slavic languages and literatures lack popularity, do not command high enrollments, and are a constant source of difficulty with administrations which seek to abolish "uneconomical" courses.¹ Consequently, with the exception of the larger universities which offer graduate work, few of the colleges now offering Russian offer even a second Slavic language, and those that do generally take advantage of local interest and demand. This fact is reflected in the relatively small number of Slavic departments in colleges and universities in the United States and Canada, as opposed to Russian departments as such. As of 1956-57, only 31 of the 173 institutions with courses in Slavic languages and literatures for which data was available, offer more than one Slavic language.² Seven offer three languages, and fourteen offer four or more languages.³ All but one of these offer graduate degrees in some aspect of Slavic studies.⁴ Alliance College is the only undergraduate school in this group with offerings in Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, and reading courses in the South Slavic and East Slavic languages. Ten undergraduate institutions offer one Slavic language in addition to Russian, in

some cases only an elementary course.⁵ One must, of course, bear in mind that these are catalogue offerings, and may reflect the desires and aspirations of a department rather than established fact.

The practical reasons for the growth and popularity of Russian studies are well known and need no elaboration here. Considerable progress has been made since the war when only a few institutions offered Russian. Today, at least 47 institutions offer an undergraduate major in some aspect of Slavic Studies, whether in language and literature, linguistics, or area studies.⁶ Approximately 87 institutions restrict their offerings to Russian language courses, but a majority have additional offerings in literature and civilization.⁷ Russian literature courses in English translation are offered by at least 63 institutions including the larger universities.⁸ It is generally recognized that many of the undergraduate concentrators in Russian were influenced in their choice of field by contact with Russian literature in translation.

It would seem highly desirable, therefore, to establish courses in translation which would include primarily the non-Russian Slavic literatures, in an attempt to raise enrollments in the non-Russian Slavic languages, and to make possible the transition from a Russian department to a Slavic department, especially on the undergraduate level. A number of universities already offer individual courses in the national literatures of specific Slavic countries, and, on the graduate level, offer courses in comparative Slavic literature. But only a few have Slavic literature courses in translation aimed at the undergraduate, and required for the major. The University of Manitoba, for example, offers in alternate years a course entitled "Slavic Literature in Translation" in which Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian material is read, and in which emphasis is placed on the writers Mickiewicz, Ševčenko, and Puškin, but this is not a required course and Serbian and Bulgarian literatures are not discussed at all.

Only four universities require some aspect of Slavic literature

for the undergraduate major: the University of California—a two-hour course entitled "A Survey of Slavic Literatures"; Indiana University—a three-hour course entitled "The Literature and Culture of the Western and Southern Slavs"; Wayne University—a selection of seven semester hours of Slavic cultural studies from the following: "Slavic Culture," "Slavic Folk Literature," "The Story of Polish Culture," and "Origins of the Slavic World"; and Boston University—a six semester hour course entitled "Literature of the Slavic Peoples in English Translation" which deals with the most important literary figures, primarily of the non-Russian Slavs, from the earliest times to the 1920's. The brevity of the University of California course can be justified by the fact that the student there may then take any of a number of offerings in more specific segments of Slavic literature, all in English translation—something that is possible in a large department. Indiana University presumably excludes Ukrainian literature from its offering and dilutes the literature side of the three-hour course with cultural material. The offerings of Wayne University do not necessarily give the student an opportunity to become acquainted with the highlights of Slavic literatures as such, although he may become very well acquainted with a specific segment of that literature, such as folk literature, the Slavic drama, Slavic romanticism, or the nineteenth-century novel.

The course at Boston University attempts to correct the shortcomings of courses offered at other institutions, and at the same time to fit into the framework of a small, undergraduate department with a limited budget—but intent on being a Slavic rather than a Russian department. The Slavic literature course, which is offered in alternate years to insure better enrollments, is currently being offered for a second time, and with a significant increase in enrollment. It will be the purpose of this paper to outline this course and its methods, in the hope that this information may be of interest and value to other institutions offering or contemplating such a course.

In the first semester, the development of Slavic literatures is traced from the very beginnings, from Cyril and Methodius through the romantic period in the nineteenth century. Some elements of Slavic civilization must of necessity be touched on in the first lecture or two, particularly in the discussion of the Slavs, their origins, geographical distribution, and linguistic divisions. Although it seems convenient to discuss the most important literary figures and works within the framework of literary styles and literary programs, no attempt is made to force a comparative approach, or to find a Slavic unity where there is none. The common cultural element, or the common or reciprocal literary element is emphasized where there is one, but otherwise the diversity of the development of Slavic literatures is clearly indicated, for this diversity is as important as, if not more important than, any unity—which is, after all, primarily a linguistic unity. Perhaps it has been this lack of a convenient guiding principle, a convenient unity, that has really hindered the development of courses in Slavic literature. However, no excuses need be made to present to the student body the most outstanding works of Slavic literature.

At Boston University, the first-semester program includes the following topics:

1. Early Slavic literature, both translated and original. The original literature includes ecclesiastical literature, saints' lives, and the chronicles of the various countries.
2. The epic tradition. Primarily a study of Russian and Serbian oral epic poetry, although the Ukrainian dumy are also mentioned, and then of the written epic, specifically, The Tale of Igor¹. Presentation of this material as a unit seems particularly advantageous.
3. The Renaissance. Attention is focussed on the Pole Jan Kochanowski and the Ragusan poet Ivan Gundulić.
4. The Baroque. A discussion of Polish and Czech baroque literature, with special emphasis on Comenius's Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart.
5. Classicism. Primarily Polish (Krasicki), Russian (Deržavin), and Serbian (Dositej Obradović), with reading

and discussion of The Life and Adventures of Dositej Obradović.

6. Romanticism. Pre-romanticism is touched upon rather briefly, and then attention is directed to the most important literary movement of the Slavic world. The reading includes Puškin's Evgenij Onegin, The Bronze Horseman, and other works, Mickiewicz's Pan Tadeusz, Ševčenko's Poems, and Macha's narrative poem May. Lesser figures are also brought in. For example, one lecture is devoted to Lermontov, and approximately two or three to the Poles Słowacki, Krasinski, and Norwid. Some preparation is always made for the introduction of the chief writer or writers to be discussed, but rather than make such a course a long and tedious catalogue of names and dates, it seems much more profitable to concentrate on single representatives of given trends in the different countries, and to read complete works wherever possible.

The second-semester program includes the following:

1. Russian realism. Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoj are touched upon very briefly, and some short work by each of them is read and discussed, primarily for the benefit of those who have had no contact with Slavic literature.
2. Ukrainian literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The reading includes selections from Ivan Franko and Lesja Ukrainka.
3. Czech literature of the nineteenth century. Reading of short works by Jan Neruda, Božena Němcová, and Jan Mačar.
4. Bulgarian literature. Reading and discussion of Ivan Vazov's Under the Yoke, as the most suitable example of Bulgarian literature.
5. Serbian literature of the nineteenth century.
6. Polish novelists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: Sienkiewicz, Prus, Reymont, Żeromski. Typical shorter works by these authors are read, and in addition the student reads a longer work in conformity with his special interests. The choice is usually between one of Sienkiewicz's historical novels and Reymont's Peasants. Under certain conditions one of the longer works of Tolstoj or Dostoevskij may be selected by a student who has never had any contact with Slavic literature.
7. The symbolist and modernist movement. Polish, Czech, and Russian materials are utilized. Authors discussed are S. Wyspiański, S. Przybyszewski, Otakar Březina, and Aleksandr Blok.

8. Post-World War I Czech writers. Reading of Jaroslav Hašek's The Good Soldier Schweik and Karel Čapek's R.U.R. or The War with the Newts.

Obviously, the organization of the course and the selection of reading material are dependent on what is available. Indeed, in this connection, when one looks at the material generally available for the period prior to the nineteenth century, one may be tempted to entitle this paper "A Case Against the Slavic Literature Course in English Translation." Most of the material in English is out of print and must be acquired via the used book dealers. This is true of such important volumes as the collection of Poems by Kochanowski, virtually the only sample of Slavic Renaissance literature available in English, and of Comenius's Labyrinth of the World, which was published in this country in 1942 and is now almost unobtainable. Material dealing with the epic tradition is generally available, as are the works of Puškin, Ševčenko, Mickiewicz, and Macha. It speaks well for the developing interest in Slavic studies that the recent edition of The Life and Adventures of Dositej Obradović, translated by the late Prof. G. R. Noyes, was completely sold out within a few weeks of publication.

Most of the material for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is more readily available from publishers and used-book dealers. Even if the outlook is sometimes discouraging, there is nevertheless a sufficient quantity of reading material to support the Slavic literature course in translation. Useful anthologies include Paul Selver's Anthology of Modern Slavonic Literature and his Anthology of Czechoslovak Literature. Dmitry Cizevsky's Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures can serve as a handbook for the whole course. Manfred Kridl's Survey of Polish Literature and Culture, translated by O. Scherer-Virski, fills a long-felt need in its field. However, more histories of the individual literatures in English are needed, particularly for Serbian, Bulgarian, and Czech literatures. The same is true

for reading material in English translation, both anthologies and individual works. Perhaps if there were sufficient demand some of the works that have long been out of print could be made available in inexpensive paper-back editions.

The presentation of such a course requires more than reading materials to make it a success. Because of the diversity of the material covered, and because quite often the literature of a given country is so closely tied to its history, it is imperative that each student be supplied with a one-page chronological-historical outline for each country. It would also be advantageous to present students with mimeographed lists of authors and works, correctly spelled, and utilizing some uniform systems of transliteration.

Objections are often made to any literature course in which the reading is not done in the original language, on the grounds that something is always lost in translation. Of necessity, however, the Slavic literature course must be one in which the reading is done in translation, but there are of course possibilities for students who know any of the Slavic languages to read part of the materials in the original. Again, the Slavic literature course in translation provides the easiest way to reach the largest segment of the "uncommitted" student body, to give the casual student a glimpse of Slavic literature, and perhaps to get him interested in doing more, either in Slavic language or literature. In any case, the feeling of strangeness or peculiarity will be dispelled, and the student will become aware of the existence of Slavic literatures other than Russian. In this sense, one can see that such a course fits into the concept of General Education, and that it can be an integrating course for students of other literatures, or of virtually any aspect of Slavic studies. Such a course would be indispensable for the undergraduate Slavic major who plans to do graduate work since he could then select a graduate school which meets his specific literary interests. It can also be extremely valuable for the graduate student, particularly for

the first-year graduate student who has completed his undergraduate major in a Russian department but who has little or no knowledge of other Slavic literatures. Such a course may increase his perspective, suggest new themes, and, indeed, provide him with his only contact with literatures that are not specifically listed in his Ph. D. requirements. Experience at Boston University has indicated that the Slavic Literature Course in Translation can command good enrollment and can stimulate interest in Slavic studies on the undergraduate level. This is the level that must be built up to assure development of graduate work and a supply of teachers to handle Russian in the public schools.⁷

Notes

1. This paper was read at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the AATSEEL, at Washington, D. C., on December 30, 1956.

2. These figures are based on an examination of the 1956-57 catalogues of those institutions listed as offering Slavic languages for 1954-55, as reported in the PMLA Directory issue, September, 1954. The present listing does not include the Monterey Army Language School, the Foreign Service Institute, or women's colleges such as Radcliffe or Pembroke which are closely affiliated with another institution. At least seventeen institutions listed in PMLA in September 1954 have dropped Russian from their curricula.

3. Three Slavic languages are offered in the Universities of British Columbia, Manitoba, Minnesota, Ottawa, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wayne University. Four or more languages are offered in Alliance College and the following universities: California, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Fordham, Georgetown, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, Montreal, Pennsylvania, Toronto, and Yale.

4. At the University of Minnesota, work in Slavic may be used only as an area minor in graduate work.

5. Polish is offered at the University of Alabama (one four-semester-hour course in Polish phonology and morphology), Boston University, Gannon College, the University of Scranton, and Wisconsin State College (Milwaukee). Czech is offered at the University of Nebraska, Texas A & M, and the University of Texas; Ukrainian, at the University of Saskatchewan; Old Church Slavonic (a one-semester course), at Brown University.

6. For a listing of institutions offering undergraduate majors, see Appendix B.

7. Of these, 14 offer only elementary Russian, 46 only elementary and intermediate Russian, and 27 offer elementary, intermediate, and advanced Russian. For complete listing, see Appendix B.

8. It is possible that more institutions offer literature courses in translation, some, perhaps, with English literature or Comparative Literature listings. Eleven schools require two or three years of Russian as a prerequisite to the Russian literature course without indication of whether the reading of the lectures are in Russian. For a complete listing, see Appendix B.

Appendix A

Selected Bibliography of Materials Available in English

Benecke, Else C. M. Tales by Polish Authors. Oxford: Blackwell, 1915.

———. More Tales by Polish Authors. Oxford: Blackwell, 1916.

Benecke, Else, & Marie Busch. Selected Polish Tales. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Busch, Marie. Czech Tales. New York: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Čapek, Karel. Three Novels: Hordubal, An Ordinary Life, Meteor. M. & R. Weatherall, tr. London: Allen & Unwin, 1948.

———. R.U.R. New York: Samuel French, 1923.

———. War with the Newts. M. & R. Weatherall, tr. London: Allen & Unwin, 1937.

Chudoba, František. A Short Survey of Czech Literature. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1924.

Cizevsky, Dmitry. Outline of Comparative Slavic Literatures. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1952.

Comenius, Johann Amos. The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart. Matthew Spinka, tr. Chicago: National Union of Czechoslovak Protestants in America, 1942.

Filip, T. A Polish Anthology. London: Duckworth, 1947.

Fedotov, G. A Treasury of Russian Spirituality. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1948.

Franko, Ivan. Selected Poems. Percival Cundy, tr. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948.

- Fredro, Alexander. Maiden's Vows. A. P. and M. M. Coleman, trs. Schenectady, N. Y.: Electric City Press, 1940.
- Gardner, Monica M. The Anonymous Poet of Poland, Zygmunt Krasinski. Cambridge University Press, 1919.
- Głowacki, Aleksander. The Pharaoh and the Priest. Jeremiah Curtin, tr. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1902.
- Hapgood, Isabel. The Epic Songs of Russia. New York: Scribner, 1886.
- Harkins, William E. Anthology of Czech Literature. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.
- . Bibliography of Slavic Folk Literature. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.
- . Russian Folk Epos in Czech Literature: 1800-1900. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
- Hašek, Jaroslav. The Good Soldier Schweik. New York: Boni, 1930. Also available in abridged form in paperback edition, No. 572, New American Library.
- Hrbkova, Šarka. Czechoslovak Stories. New York: Duffield, 1920.
- Kochanowski, Jan. Poems. D. P. Radin, G. R. Noyes et al., trs. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928.
- Krasinski, Zygmunt. Iridion. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- . The Undivine Comedy. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Kridl, Manfred. A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture. O. Scherer-Virski, tr. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1956.
- Lednicki, Wacław. Life and Culture of Poland as Reflected in Polish Literature. New York: Roy, 1944.
- . Russia, Poland and the West. New York: Roy, 1953.
- Low, David H. Ballads of Marko Kraljević. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- Lutzow, Franz A. A History of Bohemian Literature. London: W. Heinemann, 1907.
- Macha, Karel H. May. H. H. McGovern, tr. London: Phoenix Press, 1949.
- Malczewski, Antoni. Marja. A. P. & M. M. Coleman, trs. Schenectady, N. Y.: Electric City Press, 1935.
- Manning, Clarence A. Anthology of Czechoslovak Poetry. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

- Manning, Clarence A. Ukrainian Literature. Jersey City: Ukrainian National Assoc., 1944.
- Mickiewicz, Adam. Pan Tadeusz. G. R. Noyes, tr., New York: E. P. Dutton, 1930. Everyman's Library, No. 842.
- . Poems. G. R. Noyes, tr. New York: Polish Institute of Arts & Sciences in America, 1944.
- . Selected Poetry and Prose. Warsaw: Polonia Publishing House, 1955.
- Morfill, W. R. Slavonic Literature. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1883.
- Morison, W. A. Revolt of the Serbs Against the Turks (1804-13). Cambridge University Press, 1942.
- Njegoš, P. P. The Mountain Wreath. James W. Wiles, tr. 2nd ed., London: Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- Nosek, Vladimir. The Spirit of Bohemia. New York: Brentano, 1927.
- Obradovic, Dositej. Life and Adventures of Dmitrij Obradovic. G. R. Noyes, tr. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
- Orzeszkowa, Eliza. The Argonauts. New York: Scribner, 1901.
- Parry, Milman, and Albert B. Lord. Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953-54.
- Przybyszewski, S. Homo Sapiens. New York: Knopf, 1915.
- . Snow. O. F. Theis, tr. New York: Nicholas L. Brown, 1920.
- Reymont, W. S. The Peasants. M. H. Dziewicki, tr. New York: Knopf, 1925.
- Rootham, H. Kosovo: Heroic Songs of the Serbs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.
- Scherer-Virski, Olga. Modern Polish Short Story. The Hague: Mouton, 1955.
- Selver, Paul. Anthology of Czechoslovak Literature. London: K. Paul, Trench, & Trubner, 1929.
- . Anthology of Modern Slavonic Literature. London: K. Paul, Trench & Trubner, 1919.
- . Czechoslovak Literature, an Outline. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1942.
- Ševčenko, Taras. Taras Shevchenko, The Poet of the Ukraine: Selected Poems. Clarence A. Manning, tr. Jersey City: Ukrainian National Association, 1945.

- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. The Deluge. Jeremiah Curtin, tr. Boston: Little, Brown, 1894.
- . Pan Michael. Jeremiah Curtin, tr. Boston: Little, Brown, 1894.
- . Tales from Sienkiewicz. Everyman's Library, New York: Dutton, 1931.
- . With Fire and Sword. Jeremiah Curtin, tr. Boston: Little, Brown, 1894.
- Skendi, Stavro. Albanian and South Slavic Oral Epic Poetry. Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1954.
- Słowacki, Juliusz. Anhelli. London: Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- . Mary Stuart, A. P. & M. M. Coleman, trs. Schenectady, N. Y.: Electric City Press, 1937.
- Tetmajer, Kazimierz. Tales of the Tatras. Kennedy & Uminska, trs. New York: Roy, 1943.
- Torbarina, Josip. Italian Influence on the Poets of the Ragusan Republic. London: Williams & Norgate, 1931.
- Ukrainka, Lesya. Spirit of Flame. Percival Cundy, tr. New York: Bookman Associates, 1950.
- Underwood, E. W., tr. Short Stories From the Balkans. Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1919.
- Vazov, Ivan. Under the Yoke. M. Alexieva & T. Atanassova, trs. Sofia: Narodna Kultura, 1955.
- Weintraub, Wiktor. Poetry of Adam Mickiewicz. The Hague: Mouton, 1954.
- Weiskopf, Franz C. Hundred Towers, An Anthology of Czech Creative Writing. New York: L. B. Fischer, 1945.
- Zeromski, Stefan. Ashes. Helen Stankiewicz Zand, tr. New York: Knopf, 1928.

Appendix B

The following statistics are derived from a tabulation of catalogue offerings of 173 U. S. and Canadian colleges and universities offering courses in Slavic languages and literatures in 1956-57.

I. The Extent of Russian-Language Offerings.

A. 1. Elementary Russian Only.

California IT	U of North Carolina
U of California (Santa Barbara)	Queen's U
Colorado A & M C	New York STC (Potsdam)
Del Mar C	St. Peters C (N. J.)
Georgia IT	Southwest Louisiana Inst.
Harding C	Texas Western C
U of Massachusetts	Trinity C

A. 2. Elementary Russian, and Additional Material in Culture or Literature.

U of Rochester
Washington & Lee C

B. 1. Elementary and Intermediate Russian Only.

Alliance C	U of New Mexico
Allegheny C	New Sch for Soc Research
Antioch C	New York U
Arizona SC (Tempe)	U of Omaha
U of Arkansas	Regis C (Mass)
Assumption C	Rice Inst.
Baylor U	C of St. Elizabeth
Bowdoin C	St. Louis U
Carnegie IT	City C of San Francisco
Dalhousie U	U of Scranton
Duquesne U	U of South Carolina
Florida SU	Swarthmore C
Hillyer C	Tulane U
Idaho SC (Pocatello)	Union C (N. Y.)
Iowa SC (Ames)	Ursinus C
Lafayette C	U. S. Military Academy
Los Angeles City C	U. S. Naval Academy
Marietta C	U of Vermont
Massachusetts IT	SC of Washington
Michigan SC	Texas A & M C
Nebraska STC	William Jewell C
U of Nebraska	C of William and Mary
Newcomb C	Wisconsin SC

B. 2. Elementary and Intermediate Russian and Additional Material in Culture or Literature.

Beloit C	Randolph Macon WC
Duke U	Roosevelt C
U of Hawaii	Vanderbilt C

C. 1. Elementary, Intermediate, and Advanced Russian Only.

U of Alabama	Boston C
Bennington C	Clark U

C. 1. (cont.)

U of Connecticut	Ohio U
U of Dayton	Oklahoma A & M C
Gannon C	Oregon SC
Georgetown Inst. of Linguistics	Pomona C
Hofstra C	Principia C (Ill.)
Iowa SU	U of Tennessee .
Kent SU	Tufts C
U of Kentucky	U of Virginia
Lewis & Clark C	Washington U (Mo.)
Louisiana SC	George Washington U
Miami U (Ohio)	Western Reserve U
U of Nebraska	

C. 2. Elementary, Intermediate, and Advanced Russian and Additional Material in Culture or Literature.

U of Alaska	U of Missouri
U of Alberta	Mt. Holyoke C
Boston U	New Jersey CW
Brigham Young U	Northwestern U (Chicago)
U of British Columbia	U of Notre Dame
Brooklyn C	Oberlin C
Brown U	Ohio SU
Bryn Mawr	U of Oklahoma
U of California	U of Oregon
U of Chicago	U of Ottawa
Colgate U	U of Pennsylvania
U of Colorado	Pennsylvania SU
Columbia U	U of Pittsburgh
Connecticut C	Purdue U
Cornell U	Reed C
Dartmouth C	Rockford C
U of Denver	Rutgers U
Emmanuel C (Mass)	U of Saskatchewan
U of Florida	Smith C
Fordham U	U of Southern California
Harpur C	Southern Illinois U
Harvard U	Stanford U
Haverford C	Syracuse U
U of Illinois	Texas A & M C
Indiana U	U of Texas
Johns Hopkins U	U of Toronto
Bob Jones U	U of Utah
U of Kansas	Vassar C
U of Kansas City	U of Virginia
Laval U	U of Washington
Macalester U	Mary Washington C
Manhattanville C	Wayne U
U of Manitoba	Wellesley C
U of Maryland	U of Western Ontario
U of Miami	Wheaton C
U of Michigan	U of Wisconsin
Middlebury C	Yale U
U of Minnesota	Youngstown U

D. Offerings in Scientific Russian.

Elementary Only.

Columbia U
Dalhousie U
Fordham C

Massachusetts IT
Ohio SU
U of Washington

Elementary and Intermediate Only.

U of Dayton
Indiana U
U of Illinois
Kent SU
U of Pittsburgh

Purdue U
Southern Illinois U
Stanford U
Wisconsin SC (Milwaukee)

Elementary, Intermediate and Advanced.

U of Alaska
U of Dayton
Georgetown U
George Washington U

Ohio SU
Oregon SC
U of Western Ontario

II. Colleges and Universities Offering at Least One Russian Literature Course in Translation.

U of Alaska
Boston U
Brigham Young U
U of British Columbia
Brooklyn C
Brown U
Bryn Mawr
U of California
Colgate U
U of Colorado
Columbia U
Connecticut C
Cornell U
Dartmouth C
U of Denver
Duke U
Emmanuel C (Mass)
U of Florida
Fordham U
Harvard U
Haverford C
U of Hawaii
Indiana U
Johns Hopkins U
U of Kansas
U of Kansas City
Laval U
Macalester C
Manhattanville C
U of Maryland
U of Miami
U of Michigan

Middlebury C
U of Minnesota
U of Missouri
Mt. Holyoke C
New Jersey CW
Northwestern U
Oberlin C
U of Oregon
U of Ottawa
U of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania SU
Princeton U
Randolph-Macon WC
Rockford C
Roosevelt C
Smith C
Rutgers U
U of Southern California
Southern Illinois U
Stanford U
Syracuse U
U of Toronto
Vanderbilt U
Vassar C
U of Washington
Washington & Lee C
Wayne U
Wellesley C
U of Western Ontario
Wheaton C (Mass)
Wisconsin U

III. American and Canadian Institutions Offering Undergraduate Slavic Majors.

<u>College</u>	<u>Type of Major</u>	<u>Area Studies</u>
U of Alabama	Slavic Studies (linguistics)	
U of Alberta	Modern languages	
Alliance C	Polish, Slavic	E. European & Midzone
Boston U	Slavic	
Brigham Young U	Russian	
U of British Columbia	Russian, Slavic Studies	Central & East Europe
Brown U (Pembroke)	Russian	
Bryn Mawr	Russian	
U of California	Slavic	
U of Chicago	General Linguistics & Russian	
Colgate U	Russian	Russian
Columbia	Russian, Polish	
Connecticut C	Russian	
Cornell U	Russian Linguistics	
Dartmouth C	Contemporary Russian Civilization (Humanities)	Cont. Russian Civ. (Soc. Sci.)
U of Florida	Russian	
Fordham C	Russian	Russian
Georgetown Institute	Slavic langs. & linguistics	
Harvard C (Radcliffe)	Slavic langs. & literatures	
Haverford C	Russian	
Indiana U	Slavic langs. & literatures	Russian, East European
U of Kansas	Russian	
Loyola U (Chicago)	Polish	
Macalaster C		Russian
Manhattanville C	Russian	
U of Manitoba	Slavic langs. & literatures	
U of Miami	Russian	
U of Michigan	Russian	Russian
Middlebury C	Russian	
U of Minnesota	Russian	Russian

III. (cont.)

<u>College</u>	<u>Type of Major</u>	<u>Area Studies</u>
Northwestern U	Contemporary Russian Civilization (Humanities)	Cont. Russian Civ. (Soc. Sci.)
U of Ottawa	Slavic	
U of Pennsylvania	Russian	Russian
Pennsylvania SU	Russian	Russian
Rutgers U		Russian
U of Saskatchewan	Slavic	
Smith C	Russian	Russian Civilization
U of Southern Cal.	Slavic	
Stanford U	Russian	
Syracuse U	Russian	Russian
U of Texas	Czech, E. European Studies	
U of Toronto	Slavic	
Vassar C	Russian	
U of Washington	Russian	Russian
Wayne U	E. European langs. & Culture Slavic langs. & literatures	Slavic
Wisconsin U	Russian, Polish	
Yale U	Russian	

REVIEWS

Indiana Slavic Studies. Vol. I. Ed. Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw. Indiana University Publications, Slavic and East European Series, II, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1956. iii, 240, \$3.00.

This volume, a "Collection of Studies by Members of the Faculty of Indiana University," comprises a number of essays in various fields of Slavic Studies. The contributors include Serge A. Zenkovsky, Michael Ginsburg, Robert V. Daniels, Václav Beneš, Joseph T. Shaw, Dov Neuman (Noy), Bernard S. Mikovsky, and Felix J. Oinas. The articles testify to the breadth of the program in Slavic Studies developed in recent years at Indiana University, and deserve more than a casual summarization.

Zenkovsky in his essay on Avvakum (pp. 1-52) attempts to evaluate the writings of the famous seventeenth-century dissenter in their proper historical perspective. In trying to make his study as exhaustive as possible Zenkovsky gives voluminous notes, which contain a great deal of valuable bibliographical information. At times, however, the choice of sources cited appears insufficiently critical and gives the impression of being almost haphazard. Similarly Zenkovsky gives numerous examples of Old Russian autobiographical works, among which he lists The Supplication of Daniel the Exile and yet omits the important autobiography of Artemon Matveev, one of Avvakum's contemporaries. Despite such lapses, Zenkovsky's essay will prove of interest to American Slavists.

In Ginsburg's article "Koni and His Contemporaries" (pp. 53-96), he gives an interesting summary of the relations between the well-known Russian jurist and some of the Russian literary greats. Ginsburg properly ascribes Koni's memoirs to "the rich autobiographical heritage of Russian letters." Through Koni's reminiscences, Ginsburg narrates of Koni's contacts with such figures of the past as Odoevskij, Turgenev, Dostoevskij, Tolstoj, Čexov, Nekrasov, Solov'ev and others. Koni's claim to a place in Russian literature is due not solely to his memoirs, but also to the fact that he provided several writers with themes which they later incorporated in their works. Thus, for example, Koni is seen providing Tolstoj with the plots for both The Living Corpse and Resurrection. In all, Ginsburg's article brings Koni out as a significant figure in the intellectual history of Russia.

Ginsburg's essay is followed by Robert V. Daniels' interpretative sketch "Soviet Thought in the 1930's" (pp. 97-136). In it Daniels sets out to show that the "affairs of the Soviet Government" have not been "guided by a fixed system of ideology" (p. 97). In presenting a plausible account of the "extensive evolution in Soviet thought," Daniels divides the development of contemporary Soviet ideology into

three main periods: (1) prior to 1929; (2) 1929-1937; and (3) after 1937 (or, perhaps, to the death of Stalin?). Tracing the change in attitude in literature (as he does for the various phases of Soviet social and intellectual life), Daniel designates the 1920's as a period of considerable latitude in literary work, as well as in other fields of endeavor. After 1929 Daniels sees the Communist Party trying to mobilize all intellectual activities "for its own purposes": thus he shows how the RAPP imposed "rigid utilitarian standards on propagandistic proletarian writings," on all Soviet writers (p. 104). He further characterizes modern Soviet Realism as colored by "impassioned nationalism, reverence for the classics, and by an emotional rather than analytic approach" (p. 105). In concluding, Daniels confesses that he has not been able to determine whether the top leadership in the Kremlin has retained "orthodox [communist] beliefs," but his findings indicate that the "soviet regime since the revolution had changed in its essence..." (p. 130).

In the interesting and detailed study "Pan Slavism and Czecho-Slovak Policy During World War II," which follows Daniels' analysis, Václav Beneš contrasts (pp. 137-164) the Pan-Slavic dream of František Palacký (and of other Czech and Slovak romantic nationalists) with the reality of the modern Pan-Slavism—as seen in a universal Russian Empire.

Of all contributions, the most attractive form the point of view of comparative literature is Shaw's essay "Byron, the Byronic Tradition of the Romantic Verse Tale in Russian, and Lermontov's Mtsyri" (pp. 165-190). Making excellent use of several points brought up by Žirmunskij (in his study Byron and Pushkin), Shaw traces the antecedents of the "Oriental tale" and of the confession motif in Lermontov's works. In a well-knit presentation he successfully connects Lermontov's The Confession, The Boyar Orsha, and The Mtsyri to such translations and adaptations from Byron as Zhukovsky's "Prisoner of Chillon," Kozlov's "The Monk," "The Bride of Abydos," and with Byron's works in the original. Shaw examines extensively Byron's influence on Lermontov's style. He correctly sees the influence of Byron's use of exclusive masculine rhymes in The Mtsyri, in The Boyar Orsha, and in The Confession (as well as in Giulio and The Lithuanian Maid). But the chief trait of Byron's influence Shaw sees in the "proud, defiant, unrepentant confession of the heroes" of Lermontov's three tales (p. 184).

Whereas Shaw's contribution has literary appeal, Dov Neuman's publication "Five Hucul Healing Incantations" will interest linguists and anthropologists, as will Felix Oinas's thoughtful study "Russian Calques in the Balto-Finnish Languages" (pp. 225-240).

Another linguistic study is Bernard S. Mikofsky's essay on the "Origins of Slavic sobota." Mikofsky derives the Slavic sobota (as opposed to the variant sobota) from the vulgar Greek form *σάμπαρον through the intermediary of yet another popular form, this time from the Gothic-Arian-Christian *sambatō, unfortunately not reflected in any forms used by Wulfila. The form sobota he links with the Catholic Latin forms sabbata or sabbatum.

In all, the volume, Indiana Slavic Studies gives a good indication of the genuine growth of Slavic Studies at the Midwestern university. The entire field will profit with further additions to the growing list of Slavica, which now includes The Oxford Slavonic Papers, Harvard Slavic Studies, and also Indiana Slavic Studies.

Oleg A. Maslenikov
University of California

Janko Lavrin. Goncharov. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954. 62 pp., \$2.50.

This unpretentious but perceptive little book will remain in the back of the readers' minds for a long time. Although the jacket blurb advertises a "psychological approach" in Lavrin's treatment of Gončarov's writing, the truth is much more attractive.

"All good observers, however detached," Lavrin asserts, "are also subjective for the very reason that each has only his own pair of eyes and his own personal way of looking at things." This assertion describing Gončarov's approach to his subject matter serves admirably to describe Lavrin's own; his scholarly detachment in this study is as resolute as his subjectivity is evident.

Beginning with an interpretive biographical sketch, in which events and people in Gončarov's life are commented on with crisply focussed relevance to his development as an author, the book preceeds in succinct chapters to an appreciative critique of A Common Story, Oblomov, and The Ravine; then describes the too little known travelogue, The Frigate Pallas, and deftly collects the pertinent bibliographical facts together with the more interesting details of all of Gončarov's later essays and reminiscences. It closes with a chapter on Gončarov's realism in which Lavrin analyses the artistic means whereby Gončarov strove to transform "the truth of life into the truth of art without severing the link between them"

Only trifles may occasionally strike the reader adversely in this book, like the use of "granny" to translate the matriarchal babuška (Tat'jana Berežkova) in The Ravine (to Gončarov she was a symbol of the sound old Russian national principle), and a few awkward words—"comicality," for example—which seem out of place in a narrative that flows for the most part as smoothly as Gončarov's own.

The biographical note, a brief table summarizing Gončarov's personal and literary history, and a bibliography listing translations and works about Gončarov in English, French, Italian, and German along with the important Russian editions, serve as a useful appendix.

Edmund Zawacki
University of Wisconsin

Isaac Babel. The Collected Stories. Edited and Translated by Walter Morison, with an Introduction by Lionel Trilling. New York: Criterion Books, 1955. 381 pp., \$5.00.

In an intransigent critical mood one could point out that translation of many Babel's stories in which the driving force is skaz is of necessity unsatisfactory. This kind of purism, however, is petty in the face of the contribution, long overdue, which this collection represents. The Red Cavalry, Tales of Odessa, and a group of largely autobiographic Stories—that is, almost all of Babel's literary work—is there in a handsome volume compiled by a careful and sympathetic editor-translator. To the new excellent translations by Morison have been added earlier ones by different hands, uniformly revised. Lionel Trilling's essay, warm and forceful, not only establishes Babel's as one of the few "greats" of Soviet fiction, but admirably prepares

the non-Russian reader to look for the specific qualities of Babel's style, most obvious in his masterpiece, The Red Cavalry. The counterpoint of the two major themes, Jewish intellectual spirituality reflected in the barbarism and chaos of civil war—this inner core of Babel's art—is restated in the striking Babelesque device: the laconic contrast of naturalistic detail and tender introspection.

Babel's revival is taking place on both sides of the Iron Curtain. News came from Moscow that he has been "rehabilitated" after two Stalinist decades of oblivion. The tragic fate of this man who described himself as having "spectacles on his nose and autumn in his heart" makes it difficult to appraise his slender but flamboyant literary heritage without feeling his intense and binding presence in every line, the presence of an intellectual victim of the system, the inception of which he recorded in a paradoxical chronicle. Babel's style—and he is all style and genre—grew out of the welding of romantic-naturalistic ornamentalism with the tired and subtle tenderness of the heart. Style became the mirror of the paradox he himself was: a self-conscious and thin-skinned intellectual sacrificing his vulnerability on the altar of the young and savage revolution, in the absurd services of Buděnnij's Cossacks.

A "definitive" evaluation of Babel presents a problem. The temptation to place a political martyr on a literary pedestal is implicit in the problem itself of an esthetic rather than a socio-historical approach to Soviet fiction. The deterioration of Soviet literature from decade to decade creates a nostalgia for the startling, if sporadic, achievements of the faraway twenties. Nostalgia, however, is not the soundest posture for the sifting out of that which is lasting. To complicate matters, the awareness of a bias in favor of the fruitful and chaotic literary twenties, generates a compensatory caution not to exaggerate the value of the original but limited talent that was Babel's. The ambivalence Babel left behind is reminiscent of the guilty love the Russian émigré intelligentsia brings to Sergej Esenin. Having thus apologized for possible "overenthusiasm," one should be permitted the luxury of cherishing such short stories as The Death of Dolgušev and Gedali not only as deeply moving but as the best written in the twenties anywhere.

Vera Sandomirsky
Wayne University

Justinia Besharov. Imagery of the Igor' Tale in the Light of Byzantine-Slavic Poetic Theory. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956. x, 115 pp.

This book is written by a talented author, and because of this it is dangerous. Its highbrow style demonstrates that the author is well read in modern avant-garde literary magazines. Here are a few specimens of her style: "Here, in 'connivance with eternity,' through the mediacy of song, they span different segments of time"; "Then the ball of continuity is thrown from reflexion to identification"; "The dynamics of propulsion are metamorphosed from a momentum of sound into that of human passion." The names of Yeats, Bowra, Aristotle, Burckhardt, Homer, Baltrušaitis, Ezra Pound, Plato, Boccaccio, Čexov, etc., used in the most promiscuous manner and

often without any pertinence to the Igor' Tale, dazzle the stunned reader and contribute to the general impression of mannerism and lack of selectivity and taste.

Mannerism and inappropriate modernization are not limited to style. They inundate the content of the work. Mazon thought that the Igor' Tale was written somewhere in Russia in the late eighteenth century; a reader of Besharov's book unacquainted with the text of the Igor' Tale would be sure that the poem was written in the middle of the twentieth century in Greenwich Village or Provincetown. The "radar" method, the passion for geometry, surrealism, Baudelaire's system of correspondences, magic realism—all these and many other things are ascribed to the Igor' Tale.

After the reader succeeds in penetrating this heavy ornamentation, which is not easy, the very idea of the book turns out to be a misconception. It seeks to establish ties between the treatise of Choeroboscus on tropes and figures, on the one hand, and the Igor' Tale, on the other, and thus to show the place of the Igor' Tale in a culture of Byzantine type. There are, however, no direct connections between Choeroboscus and the Igor' Tale in the inventory of tropes and figures applied: the Igor' Tale also employs figures which are not listed in Choeroboscus, such as chiasmus, anaphora, anacoluthon, etc., and the figures and tropes in common are of general use. Nor are there ties in the very essence of "liturgic culture." If this character of culture may be discovered in Choeroboscus, it cannot be convincingly proved for the Igor' Tale.

In addition, the very character of the book excludes any possibility of showing the real historico-literary background of the Igor' Tale. When the author abandons for a while the world of Ezra Pound and magic realism of our time and tries to be carried to the twelfth century, the image is marred by unfounded or exaggerated eulogies to the high level of Russian culture of that time—the keynote in writings of many scholars in Moscow as well as in other countries. The clumsy and groping translation of Choeroboscus (himself derivative and systemless) —made, incidentally not in Russia but in Bulgaria—is proclaimed a proof of sophistication, which is proclaimed typical of Old Rus' culture, which . . . , etc. The real historico-literary background for the Igor' Tale is not unveiled in the book, and this is the best evidence for the opposite point of view. Had Russian culture of the twelfth century really had its Ezra Pounds as well as its Igor' Tale there would be no necessity to have recourse to the Ezra Pounds of our time.

Several fine partial observations confirming the well-known conclusions of Barsov, Potebnja, and others on motor nature and freedom of association in the imagery of the Igor' Tale, several illuminating parallels drawn between the Igor' Tale and the works of art of the twelfth century, the publication of the complete Greek text of 'Choeroboscus' treatise along with its English translation and the reproduction of the Slavic manuscript—this is what may be useful in Besharov's book.

George Y. Shevelov
Columbia University

Adam Mickiewicz, 1798-1855: In Commemoration of the Centenary of His Death. UNESCO, 1955. x, 295, \$3.00.

Adam Mickiewicz, 1798-1855: Selected Poetry and Prose: Centenary Commemorative Edition. Edited, with an Introduction by Stanisław Helsztyński. Warsaw: Polonia Publishing House, 1955. 192 pp.

The hundredth anniversary of the death of Poland's great national poet, Adam Mickiewicz, continues to inspire volumes designed to present this figure, so well loved in his own country, to the wide world lying beyond the Polish national borders. The two above share this purpose in common, and both endeavor, broadly speaking, to accomplish the desired end in more or less the same way, through articles surveying his life and "spreading influence," tributes by his contemporaries and others who have read and admired his works, and, finally, translations. In the UNESCO volume "influence" is stressed—Mickiewicz's influence in France, in Russia, in Italy, and among the southern and western Slavs, though not in the English-speaking world or in Germany—while in the Warsaw volume the emphasis is on translations, with a considerable section devoted to commentary by those alleged to have "known and loved" him. In this section, we may note in passing, there are odd inclusions, and one very important figure missing: namely, the sole person of importance in the English-speaking world who really and truly did "know and love" Mickiewicz—Henry Reeve. The fine tribute by our own George Rapall Noyes makes up in part for Reeve's absence, and for the presence of the others who do not belong in the list as given.

The two works have more than simply purpose and method in common, as both are attractive and well-printed volumes, copiously and tastefully illustrated. Some of the illustrations are of the same place or monument, and when this is the case the one in the Warsaw volume is generally superior, chiefly because it is larger and thus offers greater perspective. The UNESCO volume contains no less than eight views of Mickiewicz himself. With the two in the Warsaw volume not included in the other, we have, between the two, a remarkably complete history of the poet, visually speaking.

Unfortunately the two volumes have in common not only the positive elements noted, but a dull and uninteresting style. The critical-biographical introduction to the Warsaw volume is adequate, but we should have preferred to have it from the pen of Leonard Podhorski-Okółów, for example, like Mickiewicz a kresovian himself, and a Mickiewicz specialist. He would have injected more life into it, we may be sure. In the essays which form the bulk of the UNESCO volume the style is in most cases deadly, and cataloguish. And the essays themselves are superficial. For example: Mazzini, the great Italian patriot and spiritual leader, was, as we know, strongly influenced by Mickiewicz. From Professor Maver, after all these years, we could expect some appraisal of this influence. Instead, all we get is the scholar's "a detailed study will have to be made . . ." This is in a volume which has for its purpose, distinctly stated in the preface, to make Mickiewicz live "for the general public—which we trust will be considerable." The student of comparative literature may find something here of value, but not the "general public." And the poor "public" will be not only disappointed, but confused if it tries

to make sense out of the UNESCO essays, especially when it comes upon statements like the following, within twenty pages of each other: on page 132 we are told that Mickiewicz influenced one Orsato Pozza, "the Ragusan poet known in Croatian literature under the name of Medo Pucić"; and on p. 152, we read that he "drew close to the Croatian poet Medo Pucić, the son of an old Dubrovnik family..." Clearly the editor should have intervened here, if he really cared about his "general public." And it might be added that both volumes use the term "revolutionary" in the 1955 sense to apply to Mickiewicz from 1830 to 1855.

The many translations to be found in both volumes are for the most part from the readily available Noyes collection, and so not of great service. It would have been helpful to have some of the more obscure translations—from Reeve, say, or Garnett (these are among the best ever made). In offering us the Biggs translations (of portions of *Wallenrod* and *Pan Tadeusz*), Helsztyński does perform this service, for which we are grateful, even though we find the Noyes prose renderings superior in all respects.

The UNESCO volume contains a short list of the translations of Mickiewicz into the various languages of the west, but the list is so incomplete as to be of little use, and the principle on which it is compiled, that of chronology, renders it frustrating, since there is no index.

Both volumes are good to have on our growing shelf of Mickiewiczana, and the UNESCO volume in particular may be welcomed, if only for the summing-up by Professor Fabre of the University of Paris, as to what it is Mickiewicz lives by and will live by to the end of time. Professor Fabre sums up thus: "*Pan Tadeusz* restored to every Polish exile the presence of his country. It remained, as it were, an ideal bond, which brought them together, a place where all the sons of Poland could meet. No poet has ever performed a higher service to his country. With this poem, and with it alone, Mickiewicz, without being aware of it himself, had fulfilled his mission."

M. M. Coleman

Stanisław Westfal. *A Study in Polish Morphology: The Genitive Singular Masculine*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, VIII, ed. Cornelis H. Van Schooneveld, Leiden University, 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1956. xx, 399 pp.

Westfal's book is devoted to one of the most complicated problems in Slavic philology, namely, the distribution of the *-a* and *-u* endings of the Genitive Singular Masculine in modern Polish. The study constitutes an interesting and successful contribution to the field of descriptive linguistics, thanks to the author's rich material and its sound and thorough scholarly scrutiny. Westfal's excerpts represent sampling from about 175,000 pages of modern Polish literature, covering the period from 1890 to 1947. It is the most extensive collection of examples ever gathered on the problem, and it enables the author to approach it authoritatively and, for the first time, establish dependable statistics of frequency.

The author's methodological approach, too, seems on the whole reasonable to this reviewer. He defines the relationship between traditional considerations of semantic and "structural" (read: morphological) factors, and tries to work out a system of classification based on a distinct differentiation between them. Not fully satisfied with the presentation of the problem in earlier grammars and special studies, he finds it necessary to introduce a third consideration which he calls "formal determination." To be sure, in order to keep his arrangement in line with his distinction between "structural" and "formal" elements, the author has to deviate in certain cases from a purely descriptive approach and to resort to the historical method. He is, of course, fully justified in doing so, but it seems at times that in this context the question whether an element (e.g., the ending -ec in budulec [p. 343]) is "structural" or "formal" is somewhat academic. The author seems to underestimate the fact that in Slavic adaptations of foreign words we usually have to do with the process of both automatic and associative morphological patterning, and with the resulting semantic function of the new morphemes. In adapting the German word Bauholz in Polish, for example, the ending -ec in budulec must have been identified with the native suffix -ec together with its semantic function.

To say that Westfal's arrangement of the material illustrating the distribution of the two "notorious" endings in classes, groups, and sub-groups (over a hundred of them) is simple, clear, and practical, would be an exaggeration, and the author is aware of this. But this complexity, of course, arises primarily from the complexity of the problem being investigated. The Masculine Genitive Singular in Polish is perhaps the most illustrative example of the effect of opposite tendencies working simultaneously for centuries in Polish grammar, which created a labyrinth admittedly difficult for both foreigners and native speakers—and even for philologists—to find their way through. The linguistic facts being as they are, it has to be stressed that in the framework of his arrangement, the author knows his way very well. He does not attempt to establish any norms, but he certainly adds useful observations to what has been known of the problem. A patient reader will be rewarded by many an explanation of both theoretical and practical value.

Z. Folejewski
University of Wisconsin

Milman Parry and Albert Bates Lord. Serbocroatian Heroic Songs. Harvard University Press and The Serbian Academy of Sciences, Vol. I, 1954, xvi, 479, \$12.50; Vol. II, 1953, xxxi, 448, \$7.50.

The first two volumes of a projected series of Parry's collection of Serbo-Croatian oral poetry contain songs recorded in Novi Pazar, the center of a province known as Sandjak. Volume one consists of English translation in prose made by Prof. Lord with great care and accuracy, and of musical transcriptions made by Béla Bartók. The second volume contains Slavic texts. Both volumes are accompanied by a detailed account of collecting and recording procedures presented by Professor Lord, who assisted Parry in his work and who later

continued that work and prepared it for publication. There are also interesting introductory remarks written by John H. Finley, Roman Jakobson, and Aleksander Belich, as well as conversations with singers, and extensive textual notes and comments.

Parry's collection of Serbo-Croatian oral poetry, as can be seen from these volumes, is unique in many respects. Originally, Milman Parry, a noted student of Homeric poetry, embarked in 1933 on the collection of South Slav epic songs with the intention of finding out more data about the nature of oral poetry and of establishing the characteristics of oral style by observing this kind of poetry in a state of its living existence. Soon, his initial efforts, limited in scope, grew into a monumental collection which was not only useful for a comparative study of oral poetry but became one of the most important collections of South Slav oral poetry. In distinction from other collections, this one is concerned with and covers inclusively all aspects of oral poetry without limiting selectiveness based on themes or literary value.

By using the best recording equipment, a variety of approaches and refined methods, by selecting carefully regions and singers, by creating natural settings for singers' performances, by alternating conversations and recitatives, by checking the sources of individual songs, and by recording all variants of the same song found in different localities and on various dates of the collecting period, Parry and Lord reached the point where it became possible to learn, as Parry put it, "how the singer puts together his words, and then his phrases, and then his verses . . . his passages and themes."

As it is evident from these two volumes, the singers were given ample opportunity to express their own views and attitudes toward their art, toward individual poems and themes, to present their own life histories in the frame of the way of life of the people where this poetry flourished for centuries. The singers whose songs are printed in these first volumes are for the most part not Slavs but Moslems of Albanian descent. However, although their mother tongue was Albanian, they sang in "Bosnian," a dialect of Serbo-Croatian, and their poems describe Moslem heroes in the tradition of Slav Moslem oral poetry from Bosnia, where most of these poems originated. This is the best illumination of one of Parry's main objectives: to show "how the whole poem lives from one man to another, from one age to another, and passes over plains and mountains and barriers of speech—more, . . . how a whole oral poetry lives and dies."

It should also be noted that the series of Serbo-Croatian oral poetry represents an international undertaking. South Slav materials have been collected by American scholars supported by American institutions. American scholars needed and met full cooperation and assistance of local people—singers, interpreters, native scholars, representatives of local scholarly institutions and state authorities. Only by combining all these, could such a monumental collection have been collected and so excellently presented for the public use.

Joseph Strmecki
Indiana University

Thomas F. Magner. Introduction to the Serbo-Croatian Language. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1956. vii plus 205 pages, with two separate general vocabularies, one in the Latin alphabet and the other in Cyrillic, pages 206-237 L and 238-250 C.

This book, like that of Carleton Hodge, Spoken Serbo-Croatian, in the Henry Holt Spoken Language Series, is based primarily on the conversation method and presupposes no knowledge of grammar in general or of grammatical terms, which are explained as needed. Magner has, however, not limited himself to this method, but almost from the very beginning adds attractive reading passages to the lessons, twenty-seven in number. In addition, a short reader appears at the end of the book (pages 191-203).

Teaching Serbo-Croatian presents two peculiar problems, both of which Magner has handled very intelligently. First, although he has given priority to the Croatian dialect and to the Latin alphabet, he always gives the Serbian equivalents in Cyrillic, and prints the conversational material in parallel columns in both alphabets. The reading passages are equally distributed between Serbian and Croatian, in respect to dialect, alphabet, and subject matter. Especially commendable is the fact that he does not limit the dialect differentiations to the phonological variations between ekavski and jekavski or ikavski, but also includes lexical variations. His book is unique, I believe, in this respect; this is a welcome and valuable contribution. In Lesson 26 he gives the short fable of the Fox and the Raven not only in Croatian and Serbian, but also in Slovenian and Macedonian, thus offering examples of the other two languages of Yugoslavia. Second, while eliminating indications of accent and length from the exercises, he has carefully included them in the grammatical discussions and in the vocabularies. The student is thus not hampered by an overemphasis of the importance of the language's pitch accent.

Magner's choice of material for the conversations and for reading passages is generally good. It includes not only common situations and topics, but also much information about Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav peoples and customs. Even the music of a few songs is printed, and there is an article about the dancing of the kolo. One might question the need for including a section of some length on how to play cards in Serbo-Croatian, but this is a novel innovation in an elementary language book and not without interest.

The shortcomings of this book are the shortcomings of the conversational method itself. The principles of grammar are presented so very slowly and in so simplified a form, especially in the early lessons, that the book seems intended rather for students in preparatory schools than for those in the universities. Is it really too much to expect a college student to understand the full declension of a category of nouns, for example, at one sitting? Is it possibly not actually inefficient, from the point of view of learning the structure of the language one is already beginning to speak, to be told about the nominative and accusative cases in Lesson 2, the genitive in Lesson 4, the dative in Lesson 7, and so on, until only in Lesson 23 is the process completed with the plurals of brat, gospodin, dete, oko, and uho?

To some teachers the lack of any exercises for translation from English into Serbo-Croatian will be a handicap in classroom use of this book. Such exercises offer the student an opportunity to adapt

the sentences which he has learned by rote to new situations and require of him a careful knowledge of grammatical principles. It is disturbing to see these pedagogically valuable devices being discarded for a method which tends inadvertently to limit the student to particular memorized sentences.

For those, however, who are devoted to this method Magner's book will be extremely useful. It is certainly the best such textbook available in English.

Albert B. Lord
Harvard University

Area Study Programs: The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Papers by Lewis Galantieri, C. E. Black, James F. Clarke, Feliks Gross, Ed. Royden Dangerfield. Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, 1955. (Papers read at the Conference on The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Allerton House, University of Illinois, January 9-10, 1954.)

Sometimes a late review of a publication makes for a better assessment of its value. This is particularly applicable to a publication which strives to be both topical and basic, as this one does. The four papers it contains indicate that valuable expert opinion on Soviet and East European matters is available, though there seems to be scant evidence that it is much heeded in official quarters.

Lewis Galantieri's paper on "America's Stake in Eastern Europe" lucidly explains the work of Radio Free Europe as a function of the American stake, which he regards as "primarily a strategic stake" involving American security, which, in turn, cannot be achieved except through a "Free World unity of spirit." The by-products of Radio Free Europe's work are reassuring, even if it cannot achieve the liberation of the East European countries. First, despite constant personal anguish, the employees are growing to be convinced of the values of federalism. Second, the constant presenting of unadorned facts has a desirable effect on the will of the peoples of Eastern Europe in their struggle against tyranny.

C. E. Black's paper on "The Development of Slavic and East European Studies in the United States" touches upon a number of problems and prospects connected with the area. Since the situation it deals with is necessarily fluid, some of its assertions are open to doubt. For example, is it true, as the author declares, that Slavic and East European Studies have come of age in the United States? Is it not, on the contrary, true that there is still much too little understanding among college and university administrators of the importance of these studies for American interests and for education generally? The implication that specialized programs should be limited to a few institutions will be hard to sustain at a time when even the superior student is encountering greater restrictions in choosing his college or university. And, generally speaking, foundation support has not been spread as widely as the author believes. There is no doubt, however, that Professor Black's exposition of the importance of this area for American interests is useful and cogent, despite his somewhat arbitrary division of it into Russian and non-Russian.

Many teachers and administrators will probably find James F. Clarke's observations on "Some Problems in East European Area Studies" particularly enlightening and stimulating. It is not possible to comment on them at length. He discusses briefly the question of dividing the area into sub-groups and suggests the following: "North Eastern Europe, including the Baltic zone; East Central (or Central Eastern) Europe; and South Eastern Europe, including the Balkans." Such a division has definite merits, though, as the author himself is aware, it is not a perfect one. The observation that many academic departments which bear the designation "Slavic" are primarily "Russian" is all too true.

Feliks Gross proves in his paper on "Recent Developments in Eastern Europe" that political science intelligently applied can unravel much of the Soviet "enigma." Viewed in 1956, his observations (as the editor, Royden Dangerfield indicates in footnotes) were remarkably accurate. Let us note only one comment (made in January, 1954): "After a period of purges, liquidations, shifts in power; the Soviet Union may undergo another stage of consolidation of power."

Two appendices conclude the volume. The first is a compilation of "Selected References on East European Area Studies" by James F. Clarke; the second lists the names of the sixty-two persons who participated in the Conference. One thing is missing in this book. But it would have been impossible—or perhaps immodest—to have described the cordiality of the hosts, the excellent organization of the Conference and the rare opportunity it afforded for a full, frank, and enlightening exchange of ideas on matters of mutual interest.

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University

NEWS AND NOTES

Bibliography

The Slavic and East European Bibliography for 1956, to appear in the April supplementary issue of the PMLA, will be greatly curtailed, in that it will contain no materials written in Slavic and East European languages. The MLA Executive Committee decided that the annual bibliography published in the PMLA should "go international," and include listings of materials written abroad, in addition to materials written in the United States and Canada. But at the same time, they decided to print materials, not according to place of publication but according to the language in which they were written, and they chose to list materials written in the following languages only: English, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Scandinavian, and Dutch. It was further decided that the bibliography would be more selective than in the past, and would include only the more important materials in language and literature rather than give more complete coverage; folklore was completely excluded.

Professors Anthony Salys, J. B. Rudnyfkyj, and Zbigniew Folejewski—the new Slavic and East European bibliography committee for the MLA—protested in vain that the exclusion of materials published by scholars in this field in Slavic and East European languages would omit some of the works by the most significant American scholars, would truncate the bibliography in this field, and would largely vitiate its usefulness. The only result of their protests was the promise that the matter would be taken up in the MLA Executive Council this spring, when a decision will be made as to the nature of the 1957 bibliography to be published by the MLA in 1958.

Both sections Slavic 1 and Slavic 2 of the MLA voted unanimously at the December meetings that the Executive Committee of the MLA be petitioned to restore to the bibliography the materials published in America in Slavic and East European languages.

Professors Salys, Rudnyfkyj, and Folejewski raised the question whether The Slavic and East European Journal cannot publish the complete American bibliography in the field for 1956 and future years. They suggested that the Editor write the Executive Secretary of the MLA to inquire whether the MLA would not prefer to give up the bibliography, rather than publish one which is unsatisfactory to our branch of the profession, and whether the MLA would back, financially or otherwise, the publication of the bibliography by this Journal. The Editor wrote, as suggested. Professor George Winchester Stone, Jr., the MLA Executive Secretary, answered, strongly favoring the idea of this Journal's publishing a bibliography satisfactory to scholars in this field, though he rejected the idea that the MLA give up the publication of a Slavic and East European bibliography. He hoped that this Journal

can publish a bibliography which can be used as a model in the field and that it can become an international, rather than a strictly American, bibliography.

The Slavic and East European Journal is prepared to announce that it will make available to its subscribers this summer or early fall the 1956 American Slavic and East European Bibliography, to cover the fields of linguistics, literature, folklore, pedagogy, and matters of general professional interest to our branch of the profession. Professors Salys, Folejewski, and Rudnyčkyj will provide the Slavic and Baltic materials—including those which were eliminated from the MLA bibliography this year. The bibliography will also include the fields of Finno-Ugric, Albanian, and Modern Greek. The position of the Journal is that a satisfactory annual American bibliography is the first bibliographical need in the field. In principle, the Journal is willing, another year, to supplement the American bibliography with non-American materials, as the response to this year's bibliography indicates.

Statistics

Professor Leon I. Twarog has compiled the following statistics with regard to Slavic language offerings in the United States and Canada in 1956-57: 173 institutions offer the Russian language; 16 institutions offer beginning Russian language but no more; 52 additional ones offer beginning and intermediate Russian; 103 more offer beginning, intermediate, and advanced Russian; a total of 22 institutions offer scientific Russian; 47 institutions offer some kind of major in Russian or Slavic; 17 offer area majors. A total of 31 institutions offer more than one Slavic language; of them, 7 offer 3 languages, and 14 offer 4 or more Slavic languages. (See above, pp. 59-63.)

Collegiate Tour to the Soviet Union

A collegiate visit to the Soviet Union is available during summer 1957 for the first time since World War II. The host-director will be Dr. Edgar H. Lehrman, Assistant Professor of Russian, Pennsylvania State University. The trip will last 55 days, beginning June 20. Cities to be visited include Warsaw, Prague, Paris, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Helsinki, plus the following Russian cities: Leningrad, Kiev, Odessa, Yalta, Sochi, Tbilisi, Kharkov, and Moscow.

1957 Annual AATSEEL Meeting to be in September

The 1957 annual meeting of the AATSEEL will be at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, from Monday to Wednesday, September 9 to 11, instead of the usual time during the Christmas holidays. MLA meetings are scheduled in September when they take place west of Chicago, and the various AAT's have their meetings at the same time and place.

The AATSEEL meeting will completely coincide with the MLA meeting, with papers scheduled for the morning of September 9, and

with the meeting to be over by the afternoon of September 11. MLA Slavic 1 is tentatively scheduled to meet on Monday afternoon, September 9, and Slavic 2 on Tuesday morning, September 10.

Anyone who wishes to read a paper at the AATSEEL annual meeting should write immediately to the Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. He hopes to set up the definitive program and announce it by the first of June.

Other Meetings

There will be two Slavic sessions at the Tenth Foreign Language Conference at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, April 25-27. Fifteen papers are scheduled. The first Slavic session will be on Friday afternoon, April 26, and the other on the following morning. Dr. William R. Schmalstieg, who has been added to the staff of the University of Kentucky this year as the first full-time teacher of Russian there, has been active in planning the Slavic sessions.

Dr. Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, will be the Chairman of the Slavic Section of the annual meeting of the Central States Modern Language Association, at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, on May 4. Plans for the meeting include a luncheon meeting with papers in the afternoon.

Information, Please

The Secretary-Treasurer is compiling a list of all individuals currently engaged in teaching Slavic and East European languages, literatures, and cultures. He requests that each individual (particularly if he is relatively a newcomer to the field, or if he has moved or been recently promoted) send his current home and institutional address, rank, and field of specialty. We have never seen anything like a complete listing of people professionally engaged in the field, and the problem of compiling the list is made difficult because so many of our people teach only part-time in our field and may not be easily locatable under departmental or even institutional listings. Your cooperation is requested. Address the information to Professor Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

The Dramatic Magidoffs

Robert Magidoff, former U. S. newspaper correspondent in the Soviet Union, and author of a recent biography of Yehudi Menuhin, is reported to have completed a play based on Dostoevskij's The Possessed (The Devils). The playwright Edward Chodorov is now engaged in making a dramatization of Willie Snow Etheridge's Nila, the life story of Mrs. Magidoff. Mrs. Magidoff teaches Russian at the University of Louisville, and she is widely known as a speaker and author.

TRANSLITERATION

The following transliteration system will be used in this Journal for transliterating Cyrillic:

А а	а	Ј ј	ј	Ч ч	ч
Б б	б	К к	к	Ш ш	(SC, M) dž
В в	в	Ќ ќ	ќ	Щ щ	ž
Г г	(U, BR) g	Л л	л	Ъ ъ	(B, SC) žt (all others) žč
Г г	(U, BR) h (all others) g	Љ љ	(SC, M) lj	Ь ь	(B) ə (all others) "
Г г	(M) ġ	М м	m	Н н	y
Д д	d	Н н	n	Б б	'
Ђ ђ	(SC) dj	Њ њ	(SC, M) nj	Ђ ђ	ž
Е е	e	О о	o	Э э	è
Ё ё	ë	П п	p	Ю ю	ju
Є є	(U) je	Р р	r	Я я	ja
Ё ё	(SC) je	С с	s	Ө ө	f
Ж ж	ž	Т т	t	У у	i
З з	z	Ѣ ѣ	(SC) é	А а	(CS) ě
Ѕ ѕ	(M, CS) dz	У у	u	Љ љ	(CS) jě
И и	(U) y (all others) i	Ў ў	(CS) u	Ѧ Ѧ	(CS) o (B) ə
І і	i	ОУ оу	(CS) u	Ѣ ѣ	
Ї ї	(U) ji	Ї ї	(BR) w	Ѡ ѡ	o
Ј ј	j	Ф ф	f	Ѣ ѣ	(CS) jq
		Х х	x		
		Ц ц	c		

B — Bulgarian	R — Russian
BR — Belorussian	SC — Serbo-Croatian
CS — Church Slavonic	U — Ukrainian
M — Macedonian	

This system will be used consistently, with the following exceptions:

1. Anglicized words such as ruble, kopek, kolkhoz, sovkhov, Bolshevik, soviet, calash, troika, tsar, boyar, droshky (these spellings will be used, except in linguistic or quoted Cyrillic text, in which case the words will be transliterated according to the table above).
2. The names of individuals who have accepted a Latin-alphabet spelling (e.g., Mirsky).
3. Bibliographical references to materials published in non-Cyrillic languages (e.g., The Letters of Chekhov, as the title of the English-language publication only).
4. Geographical names in widely accepted usage in Anglicized spelling (e.g., Yalta, Moscow).



RUSSIAN SCHOOL

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont

Director: Misha H. Fayer

13th session: June 28-August 15, 1957

Faculty of native teachers • Courses leading to the M.A. and D.M.L. degrees in Russian • Exclusive use of Russian both in and outside the classroom • Russian dormitories with dining facilities • Lectures, concerts, folk dancing, Russian plays and movies.

Lecture and Seminar Courses

Dr. M. H. Fayer—*Leo Tolstoy: Writer and Moralist*

Prof. Peter Yershov—*Contemporary Russian Literature—Russian Fiction of the Turn of the Century*

Prof. Vsevolod Holubnychy—*Political and Social History of Russia to 1917—Economic Development of the Soviet Union, 1917 to the Present*

Dr. Iury Ivask—*Russian Poetry of the Nineteenth Century*

Prof. Marianna Poltoratzky—*Stylistics—Literary Criticism*

Courses in Grammar, Conversation, Composition, and Phonetics will be handled by Professors Maltzoff, Vacquier, Ivask, Pressman, Woronoff, and Fersen.

For information write: Office of the Language Schools
Middlebury College
Middlebury, Vermont

Indiana University

SEVENTH ANNUAL RUSSIAN WORKSHOP

June 17 to July 20, 1957

A five-week full-time intensive course in Russian

Classes in Russian language, literature, culture, and the Soviet World

Instruction completely in Russian

Limited enrollment, small classes

Supervised study, conversation groups, lectures, films, plays

Levels: Group I: Intermediate Group II: Advanced

Credit: Six semester hours, undergraduate or graduate

Cost: For tuition, board, and room—\$199 for single room, or \$212 for a double room (shared with another Russian Workshop student)

For further information and application forms, write

Dr. Joseph T. Shaw, Director, Russian Workshop
Department of Slavic Studies, Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana